

February 7, 1966

Germany is prosperous and well able to finance its own defense. We Americans should wake up and take a realistic and practical approach to our commitments. I cannot conceive of any other nation so freely distributing largesse as we do. Certainly Germany, if it were in America's position, would insist on, and get, its pound of flesh, with interest. And there are too many U.S. generals and colonels happy with things as fat as they are. What is needed is a sharp knife. The Germans would survive and secretly admire us for it while publicly screaming as if their collective throat had been cut.

As a former manpower specialist in the Army, it occurred to me that, in line with your idea of curtailing activities over here, you and your distinguished colleagues might find some form of a facts and figures study useful. Before my retirement in 1963, I was the manpower chief for the Fourth U.S. Army at San Antonio, Tex., for 4½ years. In this capacity I was successful in achieving a measure of economy in the use of personnel, although I was sometimes overruled by my superiors who often had no stomach for deflating the empire-building tendencies of their subordinate commands.

I propose the conduct of a congressional manpower management analysis or survey of the military structure in Europe with a view to reducing those activities still programed for retention which prove to be unnecessary. I would be glad to discuss the matter further, should you so desire, in any manner you might consider appropriate.

Very truly yours,

WALTER A. RIEMENSCHNEIDER,
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army (Retired).

Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: It was with great interest that I read your thought-provoking January 1966 newsletter, in which you describe our national burdens which accompany the maintenance of huge military forces in Western Europe. I am in complete agreement with your thoughts and ideas on this subject.

I have recently returned from an 18-month tour as an infantry officer with the U.S. Army in Germany, and I am somewhat conversant with the anachronistic situation which arises out of keeping thousands of soldiers and their dependents in a very prosperous country where the need for our presence is questionable in such huge numbers and under the present political situation.

The great bulk of our forces is in Western Germany, and the West German Government could very easily relieve us of some of our economic burdens by increasing the number of its own soldiers to take the place of our troops in Western Germany. No doubt, the West German Government would encounter some political difficulties if it chose to increase the size of its armed forces; the greatest opposition would come from the Eastern European Communist bloc countries. Additional opposition would come from other European countries and within Germany itself. I don't believe that the Soviet Union would view the withdrawal of our troops from Western Germany as a lessening of our determination to defend our West European allies, especially if we make it clear that any reduction in the size of our own forces will result in a comparative increase in the size of our allies' forces. If we were to begin the withdrawal of our troops from Western Germany, we would encounter some initial opposition from the West German Government; but for us, with our present entanglements in Vietnam, a reduction of our forces in Germany would be the most logical and intelligent step at this time. It is a fact that West Germany has the means and the manpower to increase its military strength to an

optimum level, which would allow us to maintain token forces there as proof of our determination to honor our commitments.

The presence of large numbers of troops necessitates a tremendous outflow of funds, caused directly by their dependents. Because of these dependents, our Government must provide family housing, schools, teachers, hospitals, commissaries, service stations, department stores, and other services. Of course, the slogan "Buy American" is widely circulated among our forces in Germany, but we're not getting at the cause of the gold flow problem until the dependents are returned to the United States. In some instances, our troops who are living in billets in Germany are subjected to substandard living conditions because necessary funds are diverted to the upkeep of dependents' quarters. It would certainly be a step in the right direction if officers and men were sent on tours of duty to Europe for not more than 13 months instead of 2 or 3 years—without their dependents, of course. The program of 13-month tours seems to work well with our forces stationed in Korea, so why shouldn't a similar system be instituted in Germany?

All this leads me to ask: why hasn't our Government taken any steps to remedy a situation which demands an intelligent and timely solution? A few years ago, "Operation Big Lift" demonstrated that we are capable of rapidly transporting large numbers of troops to Europe in a short period of time. Therefore, why haven't at least some of the troops been withdrawn from Europe already? Is it our Government's hesitation to offend our West German allies which has precluded such a course of action? As an interested citizen, I am curious to know whether there exists in Congress any organized efforts directed to the reduction of the size of our forces in Western Europe. Do you, Senator Young, have much support for your views on this subject?

Through your newsletters you are doing a great service to your constituents, Senator Young. You have perceptive views on a great many issues, and I have become a regular reader.

WEST BERLIN, GERMANY,
January 25, 1966.

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: I am an Air Force wife, my husband is stationed at Tempelhof Airport here in West Berlin. Last week on Armed Forces radio, on the news segment, I heard of several proposals you have made regarding servicemen in Europe. Being a serviceman's wife, I am taking this opportunity to write and tell you of my own personal views on the subject. Perhaps you will read my letter, perhaps circumstances will prevent you from ever even seeing it, but nevertheless, I am going to tell you what I feel about "our" tour here, and feel better for getting it off of my chest.

Before I proceed, let me tell you that I wholeheartedly agree with you that European tours should be lowered to at least a 12- or 13-month tour, and no families should be allowed to come.

Since we were not allowed concurrent travel, because of lack of adequate housing, my husband was here 3½ months before I joined him the middle of last July, with our two children. In all that time, he was not able to locate quarters for us, until we had almost arrived in West Berlin, that's how hard it is to find housing here. Being an airman first class in the Air Force, we are not eligible for base housing here, which is run by the Army, as is everything else in West Berlin. They, the Army, do not recognize his rank as being equivalent to their sergeants, consequently, we have to live in the so-called economy. You just wouldn't believe what we lived in for 3½ months, a

dirty filthy basement, cold and damp, with open sewer plumbing, no cooking stove, one bedroom, the rooms so small four people could hardly move around in them, for this we paid \$87.50 a month, plus we had to provide our own heat (coal), and pay electricity. You never saw such dirt and filth in all of your life, and since being here, my children have been nothing but sick, my baby son, so seriously ill in December, we had to have surgery, from an infection he picked up.

Our last 3 months, November, December, and now January, we are living in two rooms, with a kitchen, in a dirty-filthy bombed-out building, up on the fourth floor, it's 78 steps up and down, we have to share the bathroom, this to me is the most unsanitary condition ever dreamed up by man, we have to put up with the noise of the other family's comings and goings as they use the entranceway too. Consequently, we wake when they do, and cannot retire until they do, for all of this, plus all the noise, lack of adequate heat, and hot water, no clothes-washing facilities, we pay the grand sum of \$95 per month. My little girl, aged 4½, has no place to play, like back in the States, where they have yards for kids. In West Berlin, it's nothing but apartments and more apartments, street after street, for as far as you can see. Consequently, she cannot run around and get the exercise and fresh air she needs. For the past month now, my husband has been looking for another place for us to live, but finding adequate housing here is next to impossible, on his pay. As it is, we cannot hardly make ends meet, let alone pay the terrible prices the German nationals charge the American GI, who is over here protecting them against communism. The going rate for a half-way livable two-bedroom apartment is anywhere from 500 to 600 DM, that is \$150 American dollars, plus heat, electricity, and gas, if they have it, and even then, it would most likely be in an apartment building higher than Pike's Peak. Tell me Senator, when my husband brings home approximately \$153 on the 15th and 30th of the month, how could we possibly pay this outrageous amount of rent, and still be able to eat, clothe the children, and live like human beings.

Eating, that's another story. I cannot for the life of me figure out why we cannot enjoy the same benefits (prices) in the commissary here, as we do back in the States. I realize that shipping food across the ocean costs money, and someone has to pay for it, but they obtain most of their vegetables etc., from right here in Europe, but we still have to pay such high prices, that it's virtually impossible to make the dollar stretch into decent meals for my family. Everything here is at least 10 to 15 cents higher, in some cases much more, than in the States. For the very same item, and the varieties and choices are nil. Even hamburger, which is considered the cheapest thing you can buy sells for 67 cents a pound. My baby has had the same kind of baby food day in, day out now for 6½ months because they do not stock more than three or four different kinds of meats, vegetables, fruits and the like. On lunchmeats, we're lucky to bring home two different kinds, if, as I say, we are lucky, most of the time, the cases are empty. I think I'd fall over in a faint if I saw at least an inexpensive smoked pork shoulder ham on sale, let alone a regular ham, these are just not available to us.

I could go on for pages about the prices, and on how many things we have to do without, either because it's unavailable, or else they just don't have it. And, we are advised not to buy any types of food, produce or milk on the German market because even though it's edible, it's very unsanitary, they do not refrigerate meats etc., the doctor at the hospital emphasized the fact that I must not ever give my children milk bought on the German economy because of the high-

February 4, 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Morse
Allott	Harris	Morton
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Moss
Brewster	Hill	Mundt
Cannon	Holland	Muskie
Carlson	Hruska	Prouty
Case	Inouye	Proxmire
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, S.C.
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Scott
Cooper	Kuchel	Simpson
Cotton	Lausche	Smathers
Curtis	Long, La.	Smith
Dodd	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dominick	McCarthy	Tydings
Ellender	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Fannin	McNamara	Yarborough
Fong	Miller	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. THURMOND obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana without losing my right to the floor; and that upon my resumption, my speech will not be considered as a second speech on this legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOTION FOR CLOTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion for cloture and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77, an act to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

MIKE MANSFIELD.
PAT McNAMARA.
WAYNE MORSE.
EDMUND S. MUSKIE.
PHILIP A. HART.
DANIEL K. INOUE.
R. F. KENNEDY.
J. K. JAVITS.
JOSEPH S. CLARK.
THOMAS J. McINTYRE.
PAUL H. DOUGLAS.
GALE W. MCGEE.
STEPHEN M. YOUNG.
DANIEL BREWSTER.
CLAIBORNE PELL.
WALTER F. MONDALE.
FRED R. HARRIS.
EDWARD M. KENNEDY.
JOHN O. PASTORE.
CLINTON P. ANDERSON.
HENRY M. JACKSON.
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA.
HARRISON WILLIAMS.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR DIVISION OF TIME ON CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield to the able minority leader under the same conditions under which I have heretofore yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader whether it would be appropriate at this time to agree to a division of the time before the vote on Tuesday, because 1 hour will be available for discussion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 1 hour on Tuesday prior to the vote on the cloture motion be equally divided between the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the senior Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Based on the advice of the Parliamentarian, the Chair states to the Senator from Montana that, without objection, his request is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any speeches made within that hour not be charged as speeches against Senators who are speaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Tuesday, February 8, 1966, before the Senate proceeds to call a quorum and then vote on the cloture motion to bring to a close the debate on the motion to take up H.R. 77, that the 1 hour of debate allowed under rule XXII be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders.

AMERICA'S STAKE IN THE YEAR OF THE HORSE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, under the conditions I have heretofore set forth, I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Thursday, January 27, 1966, I was honored to speak on the campus of the University of California, Los Angeles, at the midyear graduation observance, when some 1,600 students were awarded degrees. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address I made on that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S STAKE IN THE YEAR OF THE HORSE

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the midyear graduation observance of the University of California, Los Angeles, January 27, 1966)

Chancellor Murphy, members of the graduating class, honored guests, my fellow citi-

zens; I am highly honored that you should invite me to speak at this midyear graduation observance here on the campus of this illustrious school. I share your pride in UCLA. The quality of its education is the very highest. Graduates from here have gone on to assume impressive roles of leadership in this vast metropolitan community, in our State, and country, and, indeed, beyond our borders. UCLA performs an indispensable service to the life and vigor of our country. I am privileged to call some members of your star-studded faculty my friends. I know your distinguished chancellor by his distinguished record in education. I salute him as one of our national leaders in university administration, and in our country's program for international educational exchange.

California colleges and universities play a major role in the dissemination of ideas among all of us at home, and between our people and those in other lands. One out of six foreign students in the United States studies in California. I am acquainted with some of UCLA's highly successful programs in this hemisphere and elsewhere. I know the verve and the vigor with which they have been undertaken, and their constructive contribution to mutual understanding and improving relations between America and the family of nations.

Californians have a long and creditable history of participation in the foreign affairs of this Nation. Years before we became the most populous State, there was a disproportionately large number of Californians in the Foreign Service of our Government in our National Capital and in overseas posts. That trend continues.

The State Department reports that, in the last 10 classes of young men and women appointed to the career Foreign Service, in each class, there were more men and women from California than from any other State.

The role of the United States in this world continues to grow. Each of us, in his time is called upon to play his part. The luxury of our individual American citizenship carries with it heavy duties, which must not be shirked, if our free Republic is to remain and is to improve. That, I think, is what education, at least in great part, is all about. Presumably, in learning to use our brains to think with, we are better qualified to become better citizens and better human beings. We are more suitably equipped to follow the rule of reason in trying to solve the complex problems which beset us at almost every turn. I urge you, in your lifetime, to accept fully your duties as Americans, and to participate actively, as citizens or as servants of the people, in the discussion, and, hopefully, in the solution of public questions. Some of those questions are here before us in our own State.

Our society cannot stand growing social unrest which erupts into violence and widespread disrespect for law. Our society is based on respect for order and the law. One of our challenges is living together in peace, beginning here at home, in our own neighborhood, and in our own communities. We need to solve the welter of social problems which spring from illiteracy and poverty and hate. We need to demonstrate that democracy can work, and does work in America, and that our dream of equal dignity and equal opportunity, under law, is not a sham. Never in our history has the opportunity for progress been so great, the training so available and the scientific achievements so plentiful to do the job as in our own time. Your generation faces enormous challenges in every sphere, in perpetuating our Republic, in seeking to advance toward a just peace, in extending to the weak and impoverished nations of this world at least a flicker of hope that they may live their own lives in some safety where none existed before, and yet may conquer the age-old riddles of famine, ignorance, and disease. Our power

February 4, 1966

I am told that the fact is we have a surplus of milk. Therefore, it makes no sense to me to deprive millions of school-children of the milk they need.

As I examine the President's proposals for new, untried, and unproved spending projects at home and abroad, I wonder if cuts cannot be made in these questionable and shaky programs instead of cutting vital support for Federal impacted areas and our own American school lunch program.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will be fit to restore these unwise cuts.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH—MAN OF THE YEAR IN VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, no Member of the Senate needs to be reminded of the outstanding work that Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has done in the area of veterans affairs. As chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee since 1959, he has introduced and guided more than 20 veterans bills to passage. These bills have brought educational opportunities, dependents benefits, and retirement and disability pensions to the men and women who have served honorably in the armed services of our country. His boundless energy and diligence on matters affecting the welfare of American veterans and their families have inspired the many Senators who have had the privilege to serve on his subcommittee. Senator YARBOROUGH has shared with many of us his extensive knowledge and experience so that we in the Senate have a greater awareness of the far-reaching needs of this deserving body of citizens.

Last week I was privileged to speak at a luncheon given by the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs honoring this distinguished Senator as the "Man of the Year in Veterans' Affairs." It was particularly gratifying to see that veterans groups throughout this Nation are aware of his concern for their welfare.

In making the presentation of this high award, Mr. Pete Wheeler, past president of the National Association, stated:

At the National Convention of the State Directors of Veterans' Affairs last year, we selected a man for our Man of the Year Award who best reflects the qualities of dedication to the betterment of the veterans in this Nation.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has served with distinction as the chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee since 1959, and he has worked on every major piece of veterans legislation which has become law during the last 7 years.

Symbolic of his spirit and dedication is his 7-year fight to have the cold war GI bill enacted. Senator YARBOROUGH fathered, nursed, and has now graduated through the Senate the idea of a cold war GI bill.

Because of his cooperation with the veterans organizations of this Nation, his active work in all areas of veterans affairs, and his many accomplishments in veterans legislation, it gives me great honor to present Senator YARBOROUGH with this silver cup inscribed to the "Man of the Year" in veterans affairs.

Mr. President, by this award the national association honored Senator YARBOROUGH for his achievements. But, more than that, it is a recognition of his fore-

sight and understanding which made these achievements possible. This recognition is particularly timely and meaningful now that the House of Representatives is about to act on the cold war GI bill. The senior Senator from Texas started the fight for this bill many years ago. In 1959 he neared success when it passed the Senate but died in the House. During the first session of the 89th Congress we in the Senate voted favorably on the bill for a second time and sent it to the House. I am confident that the House will act favorably on the bill next week, and by so doing will bring to successful fruition the Senator's efforts on behalf of the American veteran.

No one has been a more faithful friend to the veteran and his family than Senator YARBOROUGH. No one has addressed himself as clearly, nor dedicated himself as fully to the important job of seeking out and satisfying the needs of the veterans of this country. The senior Senator for Texas deserves an award as man of the year in veterans affairs, but I would say that in reality, he has been the man of the years for veterans.

INDEPENDENCE DAY IN CEYLON

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 18 years ago today Ceylon became a fully independent member of the Commonwealth of Nations. It is fitting that we should take note of this Republic as she celebrates her national holiday.

With her governmental institutions patterned upon the British parliamentary model, Ceylon has nurtured a democratic multiparty system within the framework of her own social and economic patterns. Today she is particularly pressed by the need for rapid economic expansion. Great strides are required to outdistance the pace of population growth and the attendant demands on economic resources. Falling prices for Ceylon's primary exports of tea, rubber, and coconut have shrunk foreign exchange earnings—earnings required to pay the mounting costs of imports. As a result, the Ceylonese Government has felt compelled to engage itself more actively in economic affairs.

In the international arena, Ceylon steers an independent course of non-alignment. Such independence, however, is certainly not to be construed as indifference. Indeed, during the Sino-Indian border conflict in 1962, Ceylon played an important role in seeking to mitigate the turbulence. In 1963, she likewise took the initiative in attempting to ease the religious tensions which started South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I would like to add my congratulations and compliments to those of well-wishers around the world who today salute Ceylon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business has been concluded.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14 (b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is it the Senator's intention that this be a live quorum?

Mr. THURMOND. A live quorum, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 28 Leg.]		
Anderson	Gruening	Pearson
Bartlett	Hart	Pell
Bess	Hartke	Randolph
Bible	Hayden	Ribicoff
Boeggs	Jackson	Russell, Ga.
Burd, Va.	Mansfield	Saltanstill
Burd, W. Va.	McGee	Thurmond
Dixsen	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Douglas	Montoya	
Gore	Pastore	

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

to do good is great, but, in recent months, the power to do evil and the threat of growing conflict have diverted our attention.

In China this is now the year of the horse, a time of great activity, and of greater uncertainty. It would make life simpler, I suppose, if we too had our lives prearranged in the oriental manner. It would be pleasant and reassuring to pass from the year of the hawk to the year of the dove. But we have no such ancestral contrivances readily available, no simple forecasts, except to say that this is the year of Vietnam. I would like, therefore, to speak for a few moments about this grave question, and its relationship to all of us at this gathering.

I have a difficult story to tell. Our Nation is in trouble. So, indeed, is the world. The events of the next day, or days, or weeks, or months, may well affect the course of man's journey, for generations, maybe for all time.

After 20 years of constant armed conflict, the fabric of life in the South Vietnamese countryside has largely been ruptured. Traditionally, a Vietnamese farmer's existence centered on his family and his land, with hopes that his sons would till his land in his old age. When the sons leave to fight, or are conscripted to fight, this pattern is destroyed. Two decades of infiltration and subversion and conflict, with mounting fury have damaged or destroyed life in the villages. Fields cannot be tilled, family existence is gone.

Some newsmen have come back home from Indochina with the thought that many people in South Vietnam might well choose to be Red rather than dead. They suggest that the people have been brought down to a level of life, at which even communism seems acceptable, if it means a peace of any kind.

In 1954 a million people left North Vietnam for the South. Since then the South Vietnamese have taken enormous punishment in defending themselves against the Vietcong, under the banner of a self-styled misnamed war of liberation; 117,000 casualties have been the toll. In 1965, 700,000 people fled from their homes to avoid living under Communist rule. How can we account for this determination to resist, unless there is a strong belief in life and freedom?

What should be our concern for our neighbors abroad? If our country has gone to the aid of a friend which seeks our help, should we, when difficulties mount, terminate our assistance? I do not see that that would be a very good moral rule to live by.

Whether you agree or disagree with our policy in Vietnam, the fact is that we are there—for what purpose? I would answer that we are there only for the purpose of assuring, or of helping to assure, a people's right to chart their own course, unhindered by acts of aggression from without their borders. We have applied a measured force in seeking to obtain this limited objective, which surely stands for decency and integrity by which we wish our country to be guided.

We seek to deter aggression, to make clear that its cost is, and should be, too high to pay. We believe that disputes among nations ought to be settled at the conference table. As a citizen, I applaud the President's "pause." I have no patience for politicians who publicly pick out their favorite bomb sites, as their personal nostrum for ending the conflict. Nor do I have any patience for those who want to turn around and go home. The Communist North Vietnamese and their Chinese allies appear to be confident that ours is not an enduring commitment, and that the year of the horse may help to demonstrate the correctness of their view. If the Communist so-called war of liberation were to be victorious here, make no mistake: others would follow elsewhere.

There is no understating the value of convincing the people of Asia of the integ-

rity of our commitment. The doctrine of the "Mandate of Heaven," which was widely held in ancient China, holds that the deity is always on the side of the victor. A corollary of this doctrine holds that it is wise to support the side which appears to be winning, and to desert the losing side, if the dark hours seem near.

There has been a firm response from the free nations of Asia—from Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Malaysia, Formosa, and the Philippines. A reawakened and democratic Japan has asserted its initiative in constructive diplomacy in search of a solution to the dilemma. In addition, Japan has taken the lead in the creation of the Asian Development Bank to strengthen the sinews of a free Asian society.

Even in Indonesia there has been a reversal of a depressingly long-term trend toward Communist rule, and I suspect that our larger presence in southeast Asia has given courage to those who now resist that movement.

The answer, I think, is to be neither hawk nor dove, but to move forward resolutely to stop aggression, to limit the war in accordance with our objectives and to try to bring about a just peace in southeast Asia which would have some hope of endurance. We seek no conquest. Our victory will be freedom, independence, and peace for South Vietnam. That is our goal. That is our policy. To assure these ends, we must give the peoples of southeast Asia faith in a society, designed in accordance with Asian traditions, and built on a foundation of democratic principles.

How can we implant faith of others in the democratic system? We must begin with a firm faith in ourselves. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, those other values which we hold dear, are not empty, meaningless phrases. Indeed, they are functional and fundamental ideas which have determined the structure of our own free American institutions. Our belief in these ideas lives on in our youth. They can be and have been transmitted to other societies.

Our Nation continues to evolve new institutions to meet the requirements of this new era in which we live. This capacity to grow and to adapt to a changing society has been the genius of our American system. We are casting new forms. We are still experimenting, in and out of Government, with the problem of how to make men better, not simply how to make them richer. We have built whole new organizations, the Peace Corps is a fine example, and we continue to study and to seek improvement in government at home, and in the business of living together on this vastly shrunken planet.

We desire no shoddy imitation of the United States. We are not doctrinaire. The chief advantage of our system is its flexibility. We will help foreign nations build their societies on the democratic ideal. We do not expect to export our own unique institutions, but we can teach foreign nations, from our own experience, to build on these beliefs and on the knowledge gained from an exchange of ideas of friends.

We have shown our determination to accept in full the consequences of our belief in the brotherhood of man, and of our determination that communism will be defeated by the "good news" of democracy. I do not always agree with the pessimism of Albert Camus, but I do agree that he who despairs of history is a coward, and that we must " * * * hold obstinately to that tremendous wager which will finally decide whether words are stronger than bullets."

The winning of this wager is a job for all thinking men and women. It represents the stakes for our country in the year of the horse. That is why, my fellow Americans, we must keep the faith.

Godspeed and good luck to all of you.

VIETNAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina without losing my right to the floor; that his remarks will appear elsewhere in the RECORD—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I had not finished my request: and that my resumption will not be counted as a second speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair anticipated the Senator's request.

Mr. THURMOND. I wanted to be certain that the full request would be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair submitted the request to the Senate. Without objection, it was agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask unanimous consent that I may make the following remarks without their being counted as a speech upon the pending motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill to repeal section 14(b).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from North Carolina is granted.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as I see it, we must face certain stern realities in attempting to reach a conclusion concerning Vietnam and our connection with it. These stern realities are as follows:

First. Communism has not yet forsaken its purpose of world subjugation. Proof of this statement is found in the fact that both Russia and China are furnishing weapons to North Vietnam.

Second. North Vietnam, a Communist-controlled country, is using these weapons to arm the Vietcong forces, which are composed in substantial part of trained men from North Vietnam and which are directed by officers placed in their command by North Vietnam.

Third. The question of whether or not the United States should be engaged in war in South Vietnam is an academic one. As a matter of fact, we are already engaged in such war and our servicemen are being killed and wounded daily in this war.

Fourth. Only three courses of action are open to the United States. The first is to settle the war by negotiation; the second is to fight the war with a will to win it; and the third is to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam and thus surrender southeast Asia to the Vietcong, who are simply Communist agents.

The President has been attempting to reach a settlement by negotiation. Despite the entreaties of virtually the entire civilized world, the only nations which can negotiate a settlement; that is, North Vietnam and China, have contemptuously rejected the President's offer to negotiate.

This being true, the hope that the war might be settled by negotiation seems to have degenerated into an empty dream.

As a consequence, it seems that the United States must either fight or withdraw—a withdrawal being equivalent to surrender. As I see it, the United States

February 4, 1966

cannot afford to withdraw. If it does so, all the Asiatic countries, including India, will fall under Red Chinese domination, and all the free world will lose whatever confidence its people may have in us. I hesitate to think what this would portend for the freedom of Malaysia, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and even of the United States itself.

Daniel Webster once said that God grants liberty only to those who love it and are ready to guard and defend it. America must be ready to guard and defend liberty even if such act necessitates, as it apparently does, standing firm and fighting in South Vietnam. As Kipling said of Britain in the early days of the First World War:

No easy hopes or lies
Shall bring us to our goal *

CONFESSION OF ERROR FOR OUR VIETNAM POLICY IS NEEDED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska under the same conditions that I heretofore yielded to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, to the 15 and more of my colleagues who urged the President not to resume bombing, his decision to do so is a matter of deep regret. Bombing of North Vietnam for 10 months proved totally ineffective to achieve the objectives which its proponents sought, and indeed, merely stiffened the resistance which our forces encountered.

I have received a great number of letters from all over the country approving the action of my 15 colleagues and myself. Some of these letters which were written just before the resumption are illustrative of the widespread feeling in this country.

While I have urged for nearly 2 years that the action which the President has now taken, for laying the issue before the Security Council of the United Nations, is most welcome, it would have had a better prospect of success if it had not been accompanied by a resumption of bombing which largely nullifies this sadly belated move. Had this been done right after President Johnson's election, as it was widely assumed, in view of his campaign utterances that some such action would take place, it would have had a much greater chance of success. I am still hopeful that despite the ghastly sacrifice of lives and treasure that have taken place since that time, it may not be too late to secure a ceasefire and a solution at the conference table.

Of course, it is no secret that I disagree wholly with the premises on which our steadily escalating military intervention in southeast Asia is based. The record, as set forth in an official publication by our administration, entitled: "Why Vietnam?" clearly indicates there was no national commitment, no solemn pledge for us to send our young men into

combat in South or North Vietnam. Nor is there evidence that we were asked in by a friendly government, which is one of the administration's allegations. President Eisenhower's letter to Diem of October 1954, makes clear that the initiative for the offer of aid came through him and not from Diem, although that would not have mattered, since Diem was our puppet brought by us from the United States. In any event, President Eisenhower merely offered economic aid, and that subject to many conditions in the way of reforms and improvement of performance, which were never carried out.

President Kennedy mistakenly took the advice of Secretary McNamara—whose forecasts have proved consistently wrong—by sending in a large number of advisers, perhaps to a total of 15,000. But these were merely advisers. It is only in this administration that we have sent troops into combat and started bombing.

I applaud President Johnson's efforts to get to the conference table, but unless the premises are altered, unless we are willing to confess error, unless we are willing to admit that there has been as much, if not more, aggression by us than by the opposition, unless we are willing to admit that we engaged ourselves on one side of a civil war—and obviously the less popular side—and unless we are willing to negotiate with the people who are actually doing most of the fighting, the National Liberation Front or Vietcong, all peace offers are going to be ineffective and devoid of real meaning.

We have been supporting a corrupt, unpopular regime, and alleging that we are fighting for freedom. The evidence to that effect is conspicuously lacking.

In the course of my long fight against our present involvement in an undeclared war in Vietnam, I have received thousands of letters from every section of the country—from people from all walks of life—supporting my position.

Thus from a minister and his wife living in Ann Arbor, Mich., I received a letter reading in part:

In the good name of our American ideals and purposes, and in the name of sanity, we urge you to resist any pressure to make a formal declaration of war.

We believe that our Government should be willing to negotiate with the National Liberation Front. We believe our Government should be looking for ways to form an interim government in Vietnam under international arrangements which would make a ceasefire possible. We believe that we should be using the United Nations in a search for ways to get the negotiations started. We believe we should honor the commitment which we made when we joined the United Nations to settle our disputes peacefully. We believe that any widening of the war in Vietnam is morally indefensible—and that it threatens the entire world with intolerable destruction. We believe our present policy of counting most heavily on military solutions is losing us the respect of peoples throughout Asia and Africa—who have a far better ability to understand the needs and aspirations of Asians in this moment of history—and whose friendship we need.

From a couple in Palo Alto, Calif., comes this sage advice:

We think it is terribly important that the whole question of the Vietnam war be de-

bated publicly and the more good reasons that are presented publicly for our getting out, the more able will be our Government to make peace and still have the respect of its people and the confidence of those governments around the world which look to us for support. It would be a great step forward for the American people if we could be sufficiently impressed by arguments primarily concerned with the morality, or lack of it, of our being in Vietnam. But there are plenty of arguments against our continuing there from the most practical point of view and people like Senator MANSFIELD and General Gavin are helping to supply these. President Johnson needs the latter type particularly, since he is an eminently practical man.

From a doctor in New York City comes the plea:

Please continue all efforts to avoid resumption of bombing, to seek negotiated settlement, and to end this dishonorable war in Vietnam.

Thank you and congratulations.

From a housewife in Wilton, Conn., comes this statement:

We know we cannot win militarily in Vietnam and that the problem of the Communist threat will not be settled there. Why must we kill our young men, and the Vietnamese, to prove this?

This is a protest against enlarging the war and the resumption of bombing, and a plea for ingenuity and direct action to bring about negotiations before it is too late.

From a lady in Honolulu, Hawaii, comes this letter:

Thank you for your appeal to President Johnson to continue the suspension of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam.

It is of the utmost importance that Congress retain control of foreign policy, and use the help of United Nations.

More power to the brave 15.

From a man who has lived in Vietnam for a number of years comes this letter:

As one who has lived in Vietnam for a number of years, I can only express to you my support and appreciation for the courageous position which you took last week on the question of U.S. policy in that unhappy country.

I think that it cannot be denied that America's best interests are not being served by a continuance of the policy which we have been following in Vietnam in recent years, a policy which has only served to alienate the Vietnamese people and Asians generally.

I hope that the Senate will continue to encourage a public examination of this ill-conceived policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a representative sampling of the letters I have received be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, giving only the sender's initials, the town or city and State of the sender.

There being no objection, the representative sampling of letters was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOCKTON, CALIF.,

January 15, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We welcome your voice raised in behalf of sanity and decency, and we hope you will be untiring in your efforts to bring about an end to the needless suffering and slaughter of Vietnamese, and the unworthy and futile sacrifice of the lives of young Americans in what can only be described as a very unworthy cause.

Mr. and Mrs. S. AND J. S.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to applaud your speech to the Senate on January 14, in which you urged that the United States declare an immediate cease-fire and withdraw from Vietnam.

I am thankful for your courageous stand and I hope it will cause others in the Congress to do some soul searching and find the courage to face the truth and speak out.

The terrible consequences of our globalistic policy have been stated so clearly by men of great intelligence and vision, and conscience, that it can only be self-interest and lack of courage that will keep Congress from moving quickly to stop further escalation of the war in Asia.

Most sincerely,

Miss L. G.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

OAKRIDGE, OREG.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wholeheartedly support you in your view that we have no business unilaterally in waging the war in Vietnam.

I admire your consistency and courage in holding firm to your position.

It is a pity that the American lives are sacrificed to save face in a cause that apparently neither the North nor the South Vietnamese people want. The line may have to be drawn somewhere sometime, but South Vietnam is not the time nor the place.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. B. T.

P.S.—I lived in Takotna, Alaska, when you lived in Juneau, Alaska. I like your record.

ITHACA, N.Y.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate, Washington, D.C.:

As pioneer in serious consideration of Vietnam congratulate for national consciousness maintain bombing pause negotiable.

Mr. S. S. P.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am unalterably opposed to granting further financial support to Vietnam war. Oppose bombing of North Vietnam.

Miss C. G.

HANOVER, N.H.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We support the halt in bombing and urge that you encourage exhaustive efforts for negotiation with all parties including the Vietcong.

Mr. A. H.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

DEAR SENATOR: As our Senator from Alaska I feel something should be done about this undeclared war in Vietnam. We ought to go in and finish it or get out. The President and Mr. McNamara seem to run Congress and the Senate instead of the reverse. Why the Senate lets this continue I don't know. The power to war should be in the Senate not in the hands of two Democrats who do as they please. I feel that we are at war so why not put it to the Senate and say that we do declare war. Our funds for progress in Alaska are being cut because of this condition and dam projects are being delayed. Why? (Nedersham and Rampart.)

Why we can't get the Federal funds loose to pave the Seward on a crash program I don't know. It's only 18 miles of dust now and

could be completed this coming summer in 6 months, May to October 1966 if someone would get behind this. The centennial of 1967 with the expected 350,000 visitors will travel on dirt roads and this leaves a good impression. We built the Alcan 2,000 miles in 18 months, so why can't we build 18 miles in 6 months? I for one went to Homer last summer but never again until it's all paved. Rocks 6 inches in diameter, dust so thick you can't see the next car and I broke a spring on my car. The tides held up traffic and construction bypasses were not even graded but full of holes, etc.

Now I don't know how you feel about these items but a lot of good Democrats will be voting on the other side of the fence if something isn't done to help our economy up here. The Army district engineers are going to RIF and are forcing engineers to take annual leave to keep going. The USAT had a good program this year but money was taken from here to support McNamara's war and the voters here, union and civil service workers will move elsewhere. Just thought I'd let you know.

Yours truly,

Mr. A. M. W.

SEEKONK, MASS.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wanted to commend you for having signed the letter to the President calling for a continued suspension of bombing of North Vietnam. You and Senator MORSE have led the opposition to "Mr. Johnson's war," and it is most gratifying to see the growing number of Senators who are joining you—STEPHEN YOUNG, J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK CHURCH, JOE CLARK, etc. I believe that there must be an end to this illegal and immoral war, and now is the time. I am certain you will support the two resolutions that Senator MORSE is introducing today. I have urged Senators EDWARD KENNEDY and SALTONSTALL to support these resolutions, but neither man will do so, I fear.

I watched the CBS debate yesterday, as I am certain you did. I believe that Senator MORSE really stole the show with his logic and factual statements. The peace movement is on the move, and I hope we can stop Rusk and the Pentagon from producing World War III—just to defend a brutal military dictatorship against what Senator YOUNG has correctly called a civil war in South Vietnam. I only hope and pray that our side—the forces of peace—will prevail.

I commend your stand—past and present. I wish you the best in the coming months as this debate will grow more heated. You are one of the very small handful of true statesmen in the Congress.

Best regards,

Sincerely,

Mr. W. B. D.

P.S.—"Beat your swords into plowshares."

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue opposition to Vietnam policy, press for cessation of bombing in Vietnam. Negotiations with liberation front. Prompt American military withdrawal. Responsible and factual reporting to American public.

Miss B. B.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We heartily approve your stand against bombing of North Vietnam, and we hope you will use your influence in every way possible to prevent further escalation of this conflict.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. D. B. H.
Miss K. H.

LARKSPUR, CALIF.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is to thank you for your morally courageous stand on Vietnam. Please stand firm on the maintenance of a cease-bombing of North Vietnam.

May we assure you that we are only two of many in our community of whom you have earned our respect and gratefulness.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. H. W. O.

RAYMOND, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We watch with great interest and admiration your crusade against the Vietnamese war. We strongly support cease-fire and negotiations now. We look to you for leadership in this respect.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. B. D.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We applaud your continued efforts to probe the administration's actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. The Senate should regain its reputation as a deliberative body rather than remain the President's rubberstamp in the area of foreign affairs. Pressure for negotiations and against further spread of the Vietnamese war into Laos and Cambodia must be kept upon the administration, particularly the Departments of State and Defense. We must stop U.S. atrocities, especially bombing and chemical warfare, in Vietnam. Each day we remain there and continue those practices, we further alienate the nonwhite world and step closer toward general war.

Our interference in the Dominican Republic has gone far to destroy any good feelings that were left over in Latin America from the Kennedy administration and the Alliance for Progress. Social reform is coming in Latin America whether we aid or oppose it. We must remove the image (and, we fear, the reality) of generally being on the side of the status quo. How much better it would be to return to the spirit of the Alliance for Progress.

Further, we would urge you to press for serious disarmament proposals, abandonment of MLF (and any other proposal that would diffuse control of nuclear weapons), and increased trade and cooperation with eastern European nations.

We oppose the President's suggestion of increasing the terms of Representatives to 4 years. One of the bodies of the Congress should reflect short-range changes of public opinion.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. G. E. G.

JANUARY 22, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator, Alaska,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to you early in this 2d session of the 89th Congress to urge you to encourage all moves toward peace in Vietnam—such as the cessation of bombing North and South Vietnam—and the early withdrawal of American fighting troops.

Sincerely,

J. M. E.

NEW LONDON, CONN.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
The Senate,
United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been sometime since I last wrote you. I am of course still in favor of your stand concerning this country's policies in Vietnam. I hope that the recent lull

in bombings has been a collective result of the agitation of millions of Americans who feel as you do. I can only hope that the cessation of bombing will continue.

It must be added that I feel that the ideas expressed in this Sunday's edition of the New York Times editorial represents a positive approach to the problems that remain. In addition this country must continue to search for peace regardless of the average actions of the other side. They have little reason to have faith in us as you must realize. Is there anything left of the Geneva agreement of the 1950's?

If this country is to make any significant contribution to world history it must take a moral stand—stop war, make peace, and help feed the hungry, both physical and spiritual and intellectual, etc., of the world. We have the power to do this. Imagine the results if we were to spend 25 percent of our national budget on peace and reduce the 50 percent we spend on war.

I have taken the liberty of sending copies of this letter to Senators DIRKSEN, KENNEDY, McCLELLAN, and STENNIS.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. H.

EVANSTON, ILL.

WICHITA, KANS.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,

U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Sir: We are grateful for your opposition to the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam.

We believe that the problem of Vietnam should be turned over to the United Nations.

We urge you to continue to do your utmost to attain a peaceful solution to the war.

You have our full support.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. J. N. M.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am in favor of your stand against resumption of bombing of North Vietnam. I would go further. I have reluctantly come to believe that it is the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. The people I talk to here in Philadelphia, reasonably well-educated and well-informed, are becoming increasingly disillusioned with President Johnson's performance in regard to Vietnam and increasingly concerned that by presidential fiat this country can be plunged into a major war of the President's making. What a pity we haven't the guts to say we made a mistake, and get the hell out.

Yours respectfully,

Mr. A. L.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,

DEAR MR. GRUENING: When you toured California, I heard you speak on Vietnam. I was glad to hear someone who was trying to achieve peace in Vietnam.

So I am very glad to hear of your recent letter, along with the other 14 Senators, to the President. It is extremely important to continue the bombing pause. Only in this way can we have any hope of peace—we will only have a longer war if we bomb, and make people more resentful.

I am a college student, of draft age. Many of my friends disagree with my position of being against the war in Vietnam, but none of them want to fight. I don't think very many people over there do want to fight, from those of my friends who have been drafted, and their reports. We don't want to die. The sooner peace is achieved in Vietnam, the better.

Some people feel as I do: not only do we not want to die, we don't want to kill. Whether or not they are the enemy, it is no fun to kill 15-year-old boys.

I personally appreciate your efforts toward peace in Vietnam, and strongly support you.

Very truly yours,

Mr. D. L.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It is with a very heavy heart that I write to you, now that the bombing of North Vietnam has been resumed. Nevertheless I want to express my deep gratitude for your efforts in behalf of peace.

Everything you have done and are doing is so wise, so right, so moral. You are a truly great man, a most extraordinary man. If only our administration had men of your caliber.

Please stay as wonderful as you are and please continue doing all you can to stop this horrible war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. S.

HARRISONBURG, VA.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to congratulate you on your courageous but unheeded proposals to continue the bombing lull in North Vietnam. I hope your concern for an early peace in that troubled land will soon be a reality.

The failure of the earlier bombing to achieve any meaningful purpose makes the resumption scandalous in the eyes of thoughtful and concerned people around the world. The U.S. Government should be more interested in eliminating the military regime and feudal economy of the South instead of bombing the North.

You have recently received a copy of the special Vietnam issue of the Gospel Herald. These articles reflect the views of the Mennonite Church, of which I am a member. I hope you will have opportunity to read the accounts of the Mennonite Church in action in Vietnam and why we oppose this war.

Very sincerely,

Mr. J. A. L.

GREAT NECK, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I take this opportunity to express my admiration for your brave stand in opposing the administration's immoral and unnecessary war in Vietnam.

I am urging you to continue your efforts on behalf of peace:

Starting with the immediate cessation of bombings of North and South Vietnam; initiating direct negotiations with all parties concerned, including the NLF; arranging for an immediate cease-fire; supporting free elections for all Vietnam as stipulated by the Geneva accords of 1954.

Our resources are needed at home—do not grant President Johnson's demands for additional moneys to prolong and escalate the war.

Please give this plea your serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. F. E.

AUBURN, WASH.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,

U.S. Senate,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have read with satisfaction that you are among the Senators opposing the resumption of the Vietnam bombing. I am also happy to see your name linked with that of the Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon in questioning the power of the President to involve our country

in a state of war (for that is certainly what it is), without the sanction of Congress.

I fully agree with all who question the efficacy of our actions in North Vietnam. I am not an unpatriotic American. I am trying to be a thinking American. I feel that the image we are presenting to the world is a very unsavory one. As the most powerful nation on earth, we should be the leader in establishing a peaceful coexistence with all nations without making them conform to our standards. I feel that in continuing this war, we are not only dumping our economy down the drain, but we are again sacrificing the youth of our country for a purpose that is certainly not clear to a multitude of people. If an enemy is battering against our shores I will be the first to help stave them off, but this action is something I cannot understand. What can we hope to gain even if we (is "win" the word)? We cannot hope to police "this" country forever, nor can we expect these people to accept our government as we accept it. There is too vast a difference in education and culture. Twenty years ago we were fighting the Japanese. Today we are living in peaceful coexistence. Will this be true in another 20 years with the Vietnamese? If so, why all this useless sacrifice of the very best of our youth. We are everywhere stressing education. Yet, we are preparing to draft from the seniors in high school and the students in our colleges. What are we being left with, the dropouts and the mentally retarded?

I feel that the office of the President has become entirely too powerful. This is still a country run by the representation of the people, or should be. It does look like this is becoming a thing of the past. The Constitution of the United States is still a good and strong document and I hope you thinking Members of Congress will see that it is upheld.

Thank you for reading this letter. I had the pleasure of meeting you when I lived in Ketchikan, and I respect your good judgment. I wish you success.

Sincerely,

K. H. L.

HONOLULU, HAWAII.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your appeal to President Johnson to continue the suspension of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam.

It is of the utmost importance that Congress retain control of foreign policy, and use the help of United Nations.

More power to the brave 15.

Respectfully,

Mrs. R. L. S.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: My husband and I would like to thank you and express our support for the position you and other Senators and Representatives have taken on postponing resumption of bombing in North Vietnam.

We hope and pray that President Johnson will pay heed to Senator FULBRIGHT and the demand for full congressional hearings on this involvement. We feel our Government has made and is making a terrible mistake morally and politically in the way it has conducted this whole affair.

Thank you, and don't be discouraged in your opposition, please.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. V. N.

ELMIRA, N. Y.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thanks for your courage in saying the things that need to be said about our Vietnam position.

Many, many people silently believe what you are saying, but it is not popular at this time to admit it. Our country is not really behind our acts there, but are caught between being loyal or sensible.

I hope you will continue to speak your mind publicly on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. G. F. H.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I applaud your great efforts in behalf of peace in Vietnam. Please continue the good work to bring the war there to an end and to the conference table.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. E. L. K.

BRONX, N.Y.

Senator E. GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts and to urge you to continue those efforts toward opening discussion on the floor of the Senate regarding the alarming situation in Vietnam.

At this crucial moment, we need the mind and voice of thinking people to prevent escalation and to bring to an end a war that is destroying our youth—the future of America.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. E. H.

TEMPLE, TEX.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This letter is to congratulate you and praise your stand with reference to the Vietnam war. The growing and unhappy attitude of many people toward Presidential leadership has resulted from sober and intellectual analysis of this Nation's Vietnam involvement.

In the President's state of the Union message, he stated the enemy is losing eight men to our one. In the long run, there is little consolation in this ratio of losses when our actual and potential enemies in Asia have far more eights than we have ones. And the further fact, we are fighting them in their front doors, while we are 8,000 miles from ours, presents a difficult military situation.

Since the Vietnam war did not result from a declaration of war by the United States, the people have been deprived of information that would have been disclosed had the issue of a declaration of war been discussed in the Congress.

I note that Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, stated that while he opposed our involvement in Vietnam in the first place, we are committed and have to stay in and win. There arises here a disturbing situation because it is admitted by Senator STENNIS that we should not be involved at all, but since we are we must continue to prosecute the war. If this war should be prosecuted in these circumstances, then we should defend the commission of any national error as fully and to the same extent that we should defend rightful conduct.

This war came upon the Nation from an act of national blunder.

Yours very truly,

Mr. H. T.

SUNNYVALE, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We unreservedly agree with your reported statement that we must negotiate a settlement in Vietnam. Going into Vietnam was the worst error in U.S. history and we must withdraw and regain the respect of people all over the world.

Mr. G. A. P.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Alaska,
Washington, D.C.:

Our immoral conduct in Vietnam has already lost us all prestige. Please get us out.

Mr. B. M.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want to thank you and congratulate you for asking for a cease-fire in Vietnam and withdrawal of U.S. forces from that country. The drain on our manpower and natural resources will eventually make us defenseless. While the flower of our manhood is serving the interest of other nations whose friendship is doubtful, alien citizens are being subsidized and allowed to replace our own citizens in U.S. industry and agriculture, may we suggest a return to realism as a national policy. We are not members of any pacifist group.

J. W. P.

BALTIMORE, MD.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Having set foot on Alaska soil this summer, though briefly, completing contact with 50 States I feel justified in writing to you.

I offer you my encouragement in your work to bring to an end the war in Vietnam. I feel that the outspoken criticism of our actions there by you and many others has helped in starting the present peace moves. Congress as a whole has fallen way short of adequate discussion of the goals and how to achieve them, realistically. Perhaps in the near future we can again be proud of what our country does.

Mr. G. N. W.

NEWTON, MASS.

Senator GRUENING,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your efforts to end our involvement in useless and immoral war in Vietnam.

Miss M. C.

ATLANTA, GA.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

If we continue this Vietnam war we will lose the freedom we say we are fighting for.

Mr. J. E. M.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Please denounce our senseless slaughter and savagery in South Vietnam. Demand reasonable terms for NLF.

Mrs. A. F. B.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRUENING: I am dismayed by the resumption of bombing by the United States in Vietnam.

It is my hope, as I'm sure it is the desperate hope of people of goodwill all over the world, that the Congress will now persist in measures to review the whole matter of the American role in southeast Asia, the possibility of neutralism as a goal rather than victory, the advisability of calling upon the United Nations to arbitrate the present fighting—and above all a review of the President's authority to conduct one-man war.

This last is without question the most urgent issue of our time. Regardless of the right or wrong of any current problem, a blanket authorization giving the executive the power of one-man war was a terrible mistake on the part of Congress. It may possibly prove to have been the ultimate

DAVIS, CALIF.

mistake, unless the Congress promptly and vigorously acts to repossess itself of its rightful power in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. W. B.

P.S.—May I ask your office to send me another copy of your speech entitled "An Appropriations Request Cannot Be Used To Authorize an Undeclared War"—I have had several copies of this speech, which seems to me the best statement yet made on the Vietnam war, but keep giving them away.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your continued and tireless stand against the disastrous U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

When the planners of the U.S. Constitution worked out checks and balances, they envisaged men of conscience and competence in the Senate, which thank God we have—some.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. A. J. B.

SNOHOMISH, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Just a line to express our appreciation of your signing the letter to the President urging the continuation of the suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam. (We feel virtuous about the suspension as though we ever should have started it.)

We are still hopeful that something will prevent the resumption of this horror and shame of our country and that we will really get on with securing a ceasefire and drawing in the United Nations. We are more than ever disillusioned with the President (for whom we voted), that he would proceed as he has when he could use the swelling sentiment in the Senate, and in the country, to support a stand for peace and negotiations (other than in words).

The 15 Senators involved would undoubtedly receive much more mail in this vein were it not such a task to write 15 letters. We are also writing our own Senators regretting that their names were not included (and wondering who is going to vote democratic in the next election, providing there is one).

Sincerely,

Mrs. I. R. P.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Our warmest thoughts are with you in your struggle toward the achievement of a just and lasting peace in Vietnam.

I wish to thank you on behalf of ourselves and our young children.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. B. G.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please keep fighting the administration. America will not support a major Asian war.

Mr. D. H.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We urge you to give your support to a reasoned and informed congressional debate on the situation in Vietnam, and on our objectives there and on our responsibilities in international relations. In the good name of our American ideals and purposes, and in the name of sanity, we urge you to resist any pressure to make a formal declaration of war.

We believe that our Government should be willing to negotiate with the National Liberation Front. We believe our Government should be looking for ways to form

February 4, 1966

an interim government in Vietnam under international arrangements which would make a cease-fire possible. We believe that we should be using the United Nations in a search for ways to get the negotiations started. We believe we should honor the commitment which we made when we joined the United Nations to settle our disputes peacefully. We believe that any widening of the war in Vietnam is morally indefensible—and that it threatens the entire world with intolerable destruction. We believe our present policy of counting most heavily on military solutions is losing us the respect of peoples throughout Asia and Africa—who have a far better ability to understand the needs and aspirations of Asians in this moment of history—and whose friendship we need.

It is our hope and plea that you will give your support to such changes in our present policy which will lead to a sane and peaceful solution in Vietnam under international guidance.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. M. F.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Our warm thanks to you for your public support last week of Senator Young's speech advocating withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam. We have been aware of your point of view on this matter and again want to congratulate you on your courage in taking an unpopular position. We do feel that history will favor your position and certainly more and more people are coming around to it.

We think it is terribly important that the whole question of the Vietnam war be debated publicly and the more good reasons that are presented publicly for our getting out, the more able will be our Government to make peace and still have the respect of its people and the confidence of those governments around the world which look to us for support. It would be a great step forward for the American people if we could be sufficiently impressed by arguments primarily concerned with the morality, or lack of it, of our being in Vietnam. But there are plenty of arguments against our continuing there from the most practical point of view and people like Senator MANSTFIELD and General Gavin are helping to supply these. President Johnson needs the latter type particularly, since he is an eminently practical man.

Again, our thanks.
Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. A. C. R.

GLENDALE, W. VA.

Mr. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have read the text of your address to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee regarding the Vietnamese war and would like to commend you for the courageous stand you have taken on this vital issue. I want you to know that I support you wholeheartedly.

In the crucial year ahead, I sincerely hope that you will challenge the administration's position on Vietnam and insist that it stop lying and lay the facts before the American people. I also hope that you will challenge the power of the military as a policymaking body and relegate it to its proper role in a democratic society—that of servant of the people rather than master. And, finally, I urge you to seek the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam and do everything in your power to bring an end to this brutal and unjust war.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. G. E. K.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As one who has lived in Vietnam for a number of years, I can only express to you my support and appreciation for the courageous position which you took last week on the question of U.S. policy in that unhappy country.

I think that it cannot be denied that America's best interests are not being served by a continuance of the policy which we have been following in Vietnam in recent years, a policy which has only served to alienate the Vietnamese people and Asians generally.

I hope that the Senate will continue to encourage a public examination of this ill-conceived policy.

Very truly yours,

Mr. R. S. B.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We continue to support your stand on the Vietnam question. We support continued peace efforts and we are opposed to future bombings. However, the most immediate concern is the legal question of U.S. activity in Vietnam. We do not believe that President Johnson is constitutionally empowered to prosecute this war. By whatever name, the United States is conducting a war and only Congress has power to declare war. We do not believe the 1964 resolution gave the President unlimited powers in this situation. If the President is unwilling to consult with the legislative body then Congress ought to take the initiative. We feel that it is necessary to maintain the traditional balance of power so essential to the proper functioning of our system.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. A. M.

P.S.—We also support your bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The courage you demonstrated in joining with the other 14 Senators in the statement to President Johnson concerning Vietnam was both heartening and thrilling to those of us who have felt so helpless in the face of a headlong rush into a stepped-up war. It is evident that such outspoken leadership is necessary if world peace is to be formulated.

May we encourage you to continue your efforts to put Congress back into the role of leadership.

We personally object strenuously to any more of our money going into a Vietnam war. There are workable alternatives which not even the President should be allowed to ignore.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. M. B.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I thank you for your courage in speaking out against the war in Vietnam. I am in complete agreement with you, and with the statement made by Mr. Marriner Eccles. I urge an immediate halt to the war.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. V. W. S.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is simply to tell you how much I, and I believe many other Americans

TEANECK, N.J.

like me, appreciate your courage in speaking against further escalation of the war in Vietnam.

I need not go into my reasons for being opposed to our policy in Vietnam—a failure in American diplomacy ever since 1948; politically ineffective and misguided since 1954; and morally and militarily wrong, as well, since 1963.

No answer is needed to this letter.

Sincerely

Miss J. B.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.,

January 17, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your Friday speech against our Vietnam policy. May you soon be joined by some other voices.

Very sincerely,

G. W. F.

BRONX, N.Y.

Senator A. GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to thank you for your efforts and to beg you to continue those efforts toward open discussion on the floor of the Senate regarding the alarming situation in Vietnam.

At this crucial moment, we need the mind and voice of thinking people to prevent escalation and to bring to an end a senseless and futile war.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. M. F.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

January 25, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: A friend has just sent me a copy of your address re our involvement in Vietnam, New York Times, December 11, 1965. Even at this late date, I wish to express my admiration of your fine moral courage in moving against the so-called consensus.

The lack of debate on the Vietnam issue in Congress has appalled me. I don't see how anyone who has studied the 1954 Geneva accord can escape the conclusion that we are the real aggressors, that we have set up as an independent state what was to have been merely a temporary political division, that we have prevented the free election promised in the accord. The Vietminh and Vietcong were swindled, and anyone with human imagination (as opposed to the computer-type mind) must have predicted that they would fight hard and resist another conference. Your statement that the commitments we are supposed to have made have been conditional on the Saigon government making social reforms agrees with my impression. And according to the Christian Science Monitor, January 24, 1966, the Ky regime still presents a depth of "apathy, corruption, and entangling redtape." How many American lives is it worth to maintain Ky in power?

I'm not for throwing Ky and his ilk to the wolves, but I would like to see permanent cessation of the bombing, and immediate strategic withdrawal to coastal enclaves, with good evidence that we mean to promote a free election and stand by the results, and withdraw as soon as the situation can be stabilized. We should publish our desire (not mere willingness) to negotiate with the NLF. We should adopt and implement U Thant's recently stated conditions, and use the U.N. to the fullest.

President Johnson's plan for the Mekong development is all to the good, but he should press the search for negotiations even harder than he has.

Hoping that you will continue to press your point of view and stir up as much debate as possible, I am

Gratefully yours,

Miss C. F.

WEST LAFAYETTE, IND.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We would like to make our feelings known to you concerning the Vietnam war. We oppose escalation of the war and additional commitment of United States troops to Vietnam. We believe it is the wrong war at the wrong place at the wrong time with the wrong people. Admittedly, U.S. honor and prestige is important, however, the lives of American men is more important in this particular situation.

Sincerely,

Mr. J. C. M.

LAS VEGAS, NEV.

Senator GRUENING,
Senate Office,
Washington, D.C.:

The Southern Nevada Committee for Peace in Vietnam wishes to express our support for your efforts toward ending the Vietnam conflict.

THE SOUTHERN NEVADA COMMITTEE
FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM,
35 Members

(Names could be sent upon request).

HINSDALE, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Does the U.S. Government really want peace? I'm beginning to have doubts.

Now that the spectacular of our roving emissaries produced nothing beyond the knowledge that President Johnson is a great showman, let's get down to business.

U Thant and 1,000 university professors from Illinois suggest we include North Vietnam in these talks. This makes sense. We're going to have to talk with them sooner or later and U Thant indicates that the climate is right.

If President Johnson sincerely wants peace let him prove it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. W.

ARDENTOWN, DEL.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: There are several of us in the Wilmington, Del., area who have great respect and admiration for you, your views, and your courageous willingness to express your convictions publicly even though they are unpopular with great numbers of Americans, Senators, and Presidents.

We are particularly appreciative of your statements on the war in Vietnam and wish to give you our wholehearted support. Our only regret is that we do not have someone like you for our own Senator.

I have been asked to write informing you of our support. With the current request from the President for a speedy approval to his \$12.76 billion request for aid to the war in Vietnam it seems an opportune time to dramatize our opposition and to take every step we can to prevent passage of this bill. We therefore ask what possibility there is of waging a filibuster on this bill to prevent its passage and to bring to the attention of the people of this country a full-scale debate on the issues of this war?

Not only would this bring national attention to those who oppose the war in Congress, but it would also delay and possibly stop this money being appropriated and per-

haps help to end the continuing murder in this tiny country in southeast Asia.

We are writing this letter to you and to Senator MORSE because we feel that you are two of a very few in Congress to whom we can turn for support in opposing our illegal and immoral actions in Vietnam. We hope and pray that soon this war will be brought to an end.

Sincerely,

Mr. R. K.

MOORESTOWN, N.J.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Although not a resident of Alaska, I feel I must write to you and congratulate you on your outspoken opposition to our present policies in Vietnam. I sincerely hope that you and Senator FULBRIGHT can really point out the fallacies of our position and persuade other Senators to follow in your position. I understand that Senator MCGOVERN and Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, questioned very much our present program.

We are already in a very serious situation and the further the struggle continues the worse off we will be. This being a civil war in South Vietnam, we should certainly endeavor to negotiate with the liberation front leaders and not support Premier KY, who apparently is disliked by the majority of the Vietnamese people.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. S. E. S.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As an American and Democrat who voted for L.B.J. and peace in 1964, I am appalled by the deception and enormous waste inherent in any colonial war of the Vietnamese type.

Please continue to do all that is meaningful to achieve a just and lasting peace in this embattled area so that, among other things, we can get on with fulfilling the great hopes of this country.

Is it that we keep up a continual cry for peace, a cry no one seems to believe, while shooting from the hip?

Sincerely,

Mr. S. W.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to express my support and commendation to you on your position, as reported in the papers, in regard to our involvement in the war in Vietnam.

I certainly agree that our involvement there is a tragic mistake and that every effort should be made to get out. If we don't we will still be fighting there in 1980, unless, of course, the war is escalated in which case none of us may be here in 1980.

I admire your courage in expressing your views on this subject which are contrary to the popular opinion that we are somehow irrevocably involved in that tragic deplorable war.

I would like to call your attention to a couple of articles that appear in the December 18, 1965 issue of the Saturday Review of Literature. If you have not seen them already, I am sure you will find them informative.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. F. C.

HONOLULU, HAWAII.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The Committee on Vietnam of the Honolulu Friends Meeting

has today sent to President Johnson the following telegram (with similar messages also sent to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT):

"We urge you retain peace initiative by making official strong request for United Nations involvement in Vietnam."

This committee commends the initiatives for peace in Vietnam taken recently by the President. Many aspects of this peace offensive remain encouraging. Since the war in Vietnam stems from many years of hostility, it is not surprising that a month's efforts to elicit a peaceful response have not yet borne fruit. Somehow, our initiatives toward peace must be sustained for a much longer time, and in such a way (we believe, without military escalation) as will eventually bring the other side to reduce their hostilities.

Clearly, something additional is needed.

We hope very much that the President and this administration and, in particular, those in our Congress whose role it is to advise the President, will take or advise such steps as will retain the peaceful U.S. initiatives already begun, and will continue to demonstrate to the world our intent for peace.

Specifically, we urge that the President take a strong, bold, and dramatic step in officially and formally calling for United Nations involvement in the Vietnam problem, which problem truly represents a threat to peace for the entire world.

We have appreciated the careful attention you have already given to this issue and the consideration shown to our committee. We hope very much that you can press for the above approach with all possible determination.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. D. R. B.

NORTHAMPTON, PA.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Just a note to let you know we admire your outspokenness on the Vietnam situation. It is indeed refreshing to note that there still are some clear heads in the Senate who can view a situation through wide-angle vision instead of the myopic nearsightedness of some of our leaders and have the initiative to speak out for the wishes of the American people. Since 1945, American image throughout the world has been on a steady decline, and this can be attributed to nothing other than the bungling policies of our State Department, probably acting on misleading information supplied them by the CIA and ambassadorial services.

More power to you. I only wish more Senators (including our own) were like you.

Respectfully,

Dr. M. J. S., Jr.

SAVAGE, MONT.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. GRUENING: I am writing to you for the first time to encourage you to act to establish peaceful negotiations in Vietnam. From President Johnson's message I take it he would like to escalate this war. Senator MANSFIELD and four colleagues have warned that if peace is not reached soon this will lead to a third world war. This could mean world disaster and a nuclear holocaust that could destroy all life on earth.

We Americans have been under the war clouds much too long. It is through peace, not power that this Nation can flourish.

I urge you not to allocate funds for our own destruction but to work for peace in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mrs. M. M.

GALLIPOLIS, OHIO.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Member of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am more than ever convinced that your position, in respect to Vietnam, is correct.

The President and his advisers ought to read, "The Untold Story of the Vietnam War" in U.S. News & World Report, January 24, 1966.

It is apparent that the United States might destroy Vietnam, by the use of atomic weapons, but there is no way by which this country can win the war.

Yours very truly,

Mr. H. W. C.

CHICAGO, ILL.

THE HONORABLE ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was greatly pleased to read in the Chicago Sun Times that you and your colleague, Senator YOUNG, have taken a strong stand favoring an immediate ceasefire and a withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

I admire your many previous statements in this direction and wish you success in your further efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. O. W.

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have just seen another example of the barbarisms our Armed Forces commit in Vietnam: A UPI photograph that shows American soldiers pulling or dragging, as it were, five Vietcong prisoners each of whom is tethered to the other with a rope and lasso around the neck, like draught animals, and two are carrying a weight or sack around the neck.

To say, as is often said, that the Vietcong commit various atrocities to villagers and to captured American soldiers cannot and must not still criticisms of our behavior. This awful conduct in the treatment of prisoners of war, not to mention the use of gas and napalm and phosphorus, the destruction of food crops with poisoned chemicals, the crimes of arson against villages sympathetic to the Vietcong—all impair an image of America that has taken generations to build.

Now, while there is halt in bombing North Vietnam, we increase our bombing against neutral Laos, ostensibly to cut NLF or Vietcong supplies. Today's papers suggest (quoted from the St. Louis Dispatch) that Thailand is invading Laos at our instigation, and let us remember that we have an armed force of 10,000 soldiers in Laos.

You are one of two men in the Senate who has not been afraid to criticize the war. When will your colleagues at least enter into a public debate on Vietnam?

Yours respect fully,

T. W.

BOSTON, MASS.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I would like to say that I fully support your stand on our position in Vietnam. I can see no just rationalization as to why we should be there. All this talk about preserving freedom is not true. The Vietnamese did not have freedom in 1954, and they don't have it now.

I wish we had a liberal Senator in California such as you. I hope that you keep "fighting" in the Senate for an immediate withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mr. S. B.

DALY CITY, CALIF.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Although I am not resident of your State, and so cannot actively support you at the polls, I would like to commend you for the position you have taken in opposition to our Government's war policy in Vietnam.

I believe very strongly that Asians should solve this internal Asian problem, and that it cannot and should not be settled by the white man, especially the United States acting almost unilaterally.

From the beginning, the presence of American military forces in Vietnam, without the consent of the United Nations and in violation of the 1954 Geneva accords was in defiance of the charter of that organization and a breach of international law. Our steady backing of military dictatorships, with our extravagant financial aid and underhanded military cooperation, is as morally indefensible as our original refusal to permit a popular election to be held in Vietnam, for fear communism might be installed by popular vote.

Instead of employing his justly famous political adroitness to rescue our country from the military miscalculations and political blunders that created our impossible situation in Vietnam, President Johnson has chosen to continue his ever-escalating war, that has no end in sight but more senseless death and destruction, culminating in a genocidal war with all Vietnam and a suicidal war with China and the Soviet Union.

The U.S. war in Vietnam is illegal, immoral, and impractical (is it really in the best interests of the United States to be known around the world as an aggressor and bully, and than be blasted out of existence in a total war with China and her allies?).

I sincerely hope our current "peace offensive" is successful. If, however—as I fear—it is not, Mr. Johnson's pleas for peace do not make our continued war effort any more justified now than it was a month or a year ago. I urge you to keep up your opposition to this insane war policy, bearing in mind the statement of only a few days ago by your colleague Senator STEPHEN YOUNG: "We should not be in Vietnam in the first place."

Respectfully,

Mr. S. M.

CHICAGO, ILL.

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRUENING: I am in full agreement with your stand against the war in Vietnam. I urge you to continue your fight against this unjust war.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. C. E. S.

COLLEGE, ALASKA.

January 31, 1966.

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations and our sincere appreciation for expressing the viewpoint contained in the appeal to President Johnson for additional consultation and a "go slow" policy in resumption of bombing North Vietnam. Even though your appeal was "dismissed" (in the words of a news dispatch in the News Miner of Saturday, January 29), by President Johnson, his dismissal does not invalidate the reasons for making the appeal, nor does it, ipso facto, prove that his decision is the correct one in this situation. From all that I can read from a wide variety of sources, the bombing of North Vietnam has not resulted in either a loss of will to fight, nor in any diminution

of the war effort of the NLF against American military forces.

We would hope that the Members of the House and of the Senate who are in disagreement with the administration's views on Vietnam will demand a full-scale congressional debate on the whole Vietnam issue, in order to better inform the American public as to the real facts of the situation. We would also hope that a congressional debate will be forthcoming to rescind the resolution of August 1964, which President Johnson is using as a basis for his continued escalation of American military involvement in southeast Asia. We would also hope that Congress would demand that the President include the National Liberation Front in any discussion of a settlement of the Vietnam conflict. It is totally ridiculous to pretend that the war in South Vietnam is merely a matter of Communist aggression from the North. It overlooks the whole history of Diem's oppression of the Vietnamese people, and of the revolt against him and the vestiges of French colonialism which he represented. Unfortunately, the United States has placed itself in the position vacated by the French, and we are reaping the same rewards of hatred and antagonism, for the same sorts of reasons.

We would appreciate receiving copies of all statements by yourself and the other Senators and House Members who are in disagreement with the present administration policy in Vietnam.

Again, we support your stand on Vietnam (and also your efforts in the field of birth control, which may in the long run prove to be more potentially beneficial than an immediate peace in Vietnam).

Sincerely,

C. M. H. and G. H. W.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I commend you for your courageous protest of our involvement in Vietnam. May I urge you to continue the fight in the current congressional session.

We must end this vicious conflict immediately. There is no legal, moral, strategic or diplomatic excuse for our presence in Vietnam as a military force. As you well know the myth of our commitment is easily exploded.

As Norman Thomas eloquently stated in his message to the marchers on November 27, I would rather see the United States lose face and save soul.

Sincerely,

Miss M. F.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., January 16, 1966.

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Just a word of thanks for one loyal citizen to another. I think your stand and statements on our policy in Vietnam are correct.

President Johnson has received and, as a matter of fact, apparently is still receiving, incredibly bad advice from the military * * * you can't win a war when the population is not on your side, and they are not with us over there, even though the military thinks we can bully them into it. We have one alternative, withdraw—we can do that right now without much loss of face—let's do it. The Asians, I feel, would like to settle their own problems. Let's give them a chance.

Sincerely,

Mr. J. R.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am very concerned about the situation in Vietnam and the lack of candor by the administration in

presenting its case to the American public. It is very important that the Congress carefully consider our position in full public debate.

The honor of our Nation is at stake. In 1954, when the Geneva agreements were signed, our Government, in a separate statement, made a commitment to the world not to violate these accords by force. Certainly this commitment is at least as important as the vague statements of support given to the various governments of South Vietnam.

We fulfilled our commitments to South Vietnam for 12 years. The escalation of the war and the use of American troops violates our commitment to the world. We must end the war.

Sincerely yours,

Miss B. B. M.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, and that the statement of the Senator will appear at some other place in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR CONTROL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ON INTERSTATE AND PRIMARY HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on January 28, the Department of Commerce published in the Federal Register draft standards for the control of outdoor advertising in industrial and commercial areas. As noted in the text accompanying the departmental proposals, the draft standards are "presented solely as guidelines for consideration and discussion purposes at the public hearings" which will be conducted in each of the several States during March, April, and May of this year.

Despite this disclaimer, I find it most regrettable that officials of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads have proceeded in this fashion. Senators will recall that during the Senate debate on the Highway Beautification Act last September, I offered several amendments for the administration. One of these amendments—the one about which there was perhaps the greatest amount of debate—authorized Federal control of outdoor advertising in industrial and commercial areas.

As the Senator in charge of the bill, it was my responsibility to explain the purpose of this controversial amendment. During the course of our prolonged discussion of the measure, I stated:

The language of the declaration in my amendment makes it quite clear, though I emphasize the point for the purpose of establishing legislative history this afternoon, that my amendment is for the purpose of promoting—not, I emphasize, destroying—reasonable, orderly, and effective display of outdoor advertising.

Mr. President, the draft standards published in the Federal Register are at variance with that statement and with the intent of Congress as evidenced in the committee action in both bodies and in the floor debates on the measure. Fur-

thermore, these proposals are a departure from the declared intent of the Secretary of Commerce, as expressed in his letter to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads. They are not in accord with our oral understanding when the administration amendments were pending in the Senate. Finally, they are in violation of the language of the act itself, as amended by the House of Representatives and finally enacted by the Congress.

Because the amendment governing industrial and commercial areas was such a controversial one in the Senate, the House Committee on Public Works gave particular attention to it when S. 2084 was referred to that body. House Report 1084, which accompanied the bill, states:

The committee, recognizing the importance of subsection (d) requested an advance interpretation by the Secretary of Commerce as to how this section would be carried out if this legislation becomes law. The following letter addressed to the Honorable JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, from the Secretary of Commerce is printed in full within the report to indicate quite clearly what the Secretary informed the committee the administration's position will be in the implementation of this program.

Mr. President, I now excerpt from the Secretary's letter as published in the House report:

The criteria to be followed in setting the standards for billboards in both zoned and unzoned areas, designated as commercial or industrial, would be designed to assist the advertising industry to achieve an orderly development of this important and legitimate business enterprise.

In order to prevent an unchecked proliferation which not only results in a public eyesore but undoubtedly impedes the effectiveness of billboard advertising, reasonable standards pertaining to size, spacing and number of billboards would be developed. Our great new highways are opening up vast areas of inestimable value for commercial and industrial activities. The standards for outdoor advertising would be aimed at assuring a pattern of reasonable development as the advertising industry reaches new dimensions.

Clearly, Mr. President, the Secretary was principally concerned with the control of future placement of signs in these areas, not the wiping out of all existing structures. Later, in the same letter, Secretary Connor stated:

It is the intention of the administration that the regulations, insofar as they are consistent with the purposes of this act, shall be helpful to the advertising industry and that, for instance, standards of size which may be adopted would be insofar as possible consistent with standard size billboards in customary use.

It is quite evident that the declared purpose of the administration in seeking this amendment was not to destroy the outdoor advertising industry, but to achieve an orderly development of this "important and legitimate business enterprise." This principle was further strengthened in the language of the act itself, when the House adopted the Tuten amendment establishing standards of size, lighting and spacing, "consistent with customary use."

In recommending the House amendments for final Senate passage, I ex-

plained the effect and intent of the Tuten amendment in these words:

The words "consistent with customary use" were not contained in the Senate version of S. 2084. The sponsor of this amendment explained during the course of the House debate on S. 2084 that it was his purpose to write into the statute the interpretation stated in the letter from the Secretary of Commerce. Certainly, it seems to me that any regulations which the Secretary adopts in agreement with the States should, consistent with the purposes of this act, be helpful to the advertising industry. Any regulations or criteria with respect to size, spacing, and lighting of outdoor advertising signs should, insofar as possible, be consistent with customary use in the industry. Therefore, I cannot perceive any valid objection to this particular language in the House approved bill.

Mr. President, I have not had the opportunity for an exhaustive study of what the proposed standards—if implemented—would do to the outdoor advertising industry in industrial and commercial areas. I shall, therefore, limit my comments to those criteria which offer only the most glaring examples of contravention of the intent of Congress.

At no time during our hearings, in conferences or in correspondence with departmental officials, or during the floor debates, was there any reference to the question of setbacks for advertising structures. Yet the draft standards propose a maximum size of 300 square feet for any structure within 150 feet of the nearest edge of the traveled way. This refers—I emphasize—to industrial and commercial, and hence, largely urban areas, where a setback of 150 feet is exceedingly rare and often impossible to obtain. The size limitation imposed by this standard would in effect completely eliminate the standard poster bulletin now in customary use.

Furthermore, the draft standards would require a minimum setback of 25 feet for all signs, regardless of whether local zoning regulations require setbacks for other business structures. I am informed by one of my constituents engaged in this industry—a most responsible businessman—that this one standard would make worthless much of his recent investment of \$200,000 in purchase and leasing of sites.

Another proposal in contravention of the principle of customary use is that which would limit the height of all signs to 30 feet above the ground or the nearest edge of the right-of-way. This would wipe out all signs on the top of buildings in our urban areas—structures which have been in customary use for many years.

Finally, Mr. President, the draft standards would require that signs would be spaced not less than 500 feet apart and no more than six signs within any mile distance measures from any direction. This proposal—if implemented—would virtually abolish the outdoor advertising industry from the urban areas of America, because it would leave so few structures permissible that no enterprise could survive. This was not the intent of the Congress, nor was it the declared intent of the administration when the Highway Beautification Act was pending in the Congress.

I am informed that some highway departments have already assumed that the published guidelines are the standards under which they will have to operate. If this is so, then substantial damage has been inflicted on the industry by the mere publication of the draft standards. Acknowledging the predisposition of many businessmen to become over-anxious at the prospect of any Federal controls or regulations, in this instance there would appear to be a valid concern. For again, I state that I am at a loss to understand why administration officials found it necessary or desirable to publish even draft standards which depart so greatly from the intent of Congress.

The primary purpose of the Highway Beautification Act was to develop the recreational and scenic values of the American highway system, principally in the rural and semirural areas. With regard to industrial and commercial areas, subsection (d) of title I was presented to the Congress principally as a preventive measure rather than a curative one. I am aware of the need not only for facelifting, but for basic reconstruction of many of America's cities. I endorse the proposals of President Johnson which are directed toward that goal. And though this was not the basic justification for the Highway Beautification Act, I doubt not that this legislation can be and should be used to eliminate extreme cases of billboard blight in our urban areas.

But the draft standards of the Department of Commerce would go far beyond that, and would—if carried out—virtually eliminate the industry. It is therefore my hope that these proposals are not an augury of how the Highway Beautification Act will be administered. For if they are, the Senate Subcommittee on Roads, however reluctantly, may have to reexamine this legislation this year rather than in 1967 as the act requires. I hope this will not be necessary.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me so that I may ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be permitted to propound questions to the Senator from West Virginia at this point, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads [Mr. RANDOLPH] who so effectively guided the Highway Beautification Act through the Senate last year, has presented a much-needed clarification of the congressional intent of subsection (d) of title I of the act. It is needed at this time because of the extreme departure of the proposed guidelines from the intent of Congress when this measure was enacted last September.

I share the concern of the senior Senator from West Virginia and associate myself with his remarks. The nature of the draft standards caught me by sur-

prise, as I am sure it did many other members of the Committee on Public Works and independent businessmen dependent on outdoor advertising. Though I too have not had the opportunity to study the proposals in detail, during the last few days I have begun to receive a number of queries from interested persons in the State of Utah who are most anxious concerning the implications of the proposed standards.

On February 2, I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads requesting that our subcommittee initiate hearings on this problem in advance of the hearings scheduled by the Bureau of Public Roads in Salt Lake City on March 1. This will be the first of the series of hearings scheduled for each of the States, and it is my opinion that a committee inquiry into this question prior to the administration hearings might be helpful. I would appreciate at this time having the views of the chairman of the subcommittee regarding my suggestion for hearings prior to the Bureau of Public Roads hearings which will begin on March 1.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of the able junior Senator from Utah, it seems to me that at this time it is not advisable for the subcommittee to hold hearings prior to the hearings of the Bureau of Public Roads which will be held beginning the first of March in the various States. But I assure him that the subcommittee will be watching the situation very carefully, and that we will institute such hearings if the circumstances seem to require. I hope this is sufficient assurance to the Senator of the concern which I share with him, as these hearings move forward in the several States.

Mr. MOSS. One thing which gives me concern is that publication of the draft standards in the Federal Register and the conducting of hearings by the Bureau of Public Roads based on those published standards may tend to crystallize them into effect, as it were, and perhaps it might be wise if we could short-stop it at an earlier point.

Mr. RANDOLPH. As I have stated, I can understand the Senator's concern and that of the business interests which would be affected, but at this point I feel, as I earlier indicated in my statement and in the colloquy which I have conducted with the Senator from Utah, that those who will manage the scheduled hearings will study this Record and read what we have said here today. I believe, for the time being, at least, that the views expressed on the Senate floor today will have a salutary effect in tempering or moderating the impact of the proposed guidelines.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I too, wish to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads for his excellent statement calling this serious problem to the attention of Senators.

I vigorously agree with what the Senator has said to the effect that the pro-

posals now made by the Secretary of Commerce are in contravention of the intent of the Congress as expressed last year, and of the assurances which were given to the Congress by administration officials concerning the legislation. I was concerned, and fearful of the possibility of such an interpretation of this section of the law last year. I believe the Senator from West Virginia has done a great service here today in making his statement and letting the Department know that we will continue, in our committee, to keep their actions under surveillance as to whether they are carrying out the intent of Congress under this act; and I ask the distinguished Senator whether it is planned that we shall receive from the Department of Commerce transcripts of their hearings throughout the States, so that we may know whether to do what the Senator has indicated should it become necessary—hold additional hearings on this legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The cogent comment of the Senator from Oklahoma makes an addition to the earlier statement I made during colloquy with the able Senator from Utah.

I have already given thought to asking for the transcripts of those hearings; and now that the Senator from Oklahoma has indicated that he believes the subcommittee should have those transcripts, I assure the Senator that we shall be kept current by the reports coming to us from those who conduct the hearings.

I compliment the Senator from Oklahoma, and I remember the attention which he gave to this legislation in the Subcommittee on Public Roads, in the Committee on Public Works, and then during the Senate debate. He is knowledgeable on this subject. He has real concern for legitimate business in his State of Oklahoma, as I have for legitimate business in the State of West Virginia, and as other Senators have for legitimate business in their States. Thus, the recommendations which the Senator has made are quite in order and I am completely in agreement with the general tenor of his statement. The chairman of the subcommittee will request a copy of each of the transcripts of the scheduled hearings by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his generous statements, and again thank him for being so alert in calling these proposals to our attention. I had not personally seen them until he had called them to our attention. His statement today will have a salutary effect upon the department in causing them, I trust, to withdraw from some of the more stringent parts of the proposal which would conflict with the intent of Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that we are all agreed they are in error in their guidelines. As to how far those guidelines might function in galvanizing opinion into the actual procedures under which the act will be enforced, this is a matter about which we will know more in the next few weeks.

February 4, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2029

strate that the progress we want for ourselves we want also for all mankind.

The President's program, as I understand it, promises not only cooperation to benefit our neighbors in the world, but enduring rewards for the people of the United States.

Through the International Health and Education Acts of 1966 we will give new strength to our schools and universities for international cooperation; create new opportunities for Americans to serve in international health and education careers; broaden and deepen our Nation's exchange programs; and extend our knowledge of educational technique to nations in need.

Certainly all of us can support these aims. I hope that Congress will respond with vigor and dispatch to this opportunity. And I hope that these bold programs will do much to alleviate misery and enlarge understanding in a world whose need for educational progress is great. For what Jefferson said in the 18th century is more than ever true today:

No better foundation than education can be found if we are to preserve human freedom and happiness.

INVESTIGATING THE CIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on January 24, Senator McCARTHY offered a Senate resolution (S. Res. 210) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations, or a duly authorized subcommittee, "to make a full and complete study of the operations and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency" in its effects upon foreign policy. That bill is now before the Foreign Relations Committee to which it was referred.

On the same date Senator Young offered a bill (S. 2815) calling for study and investigation of the activities and operations of the Agency by a continuing 12-member joint committee. There have also been comments on the need for such legislative attention to the CIA from members of the House of Representatives.

On Monday, January 31, the Washington Post published a column entitled "Left in the Cold," by Joseph Kraft, in which he dealt with the CIA and the growing need for an inquiry such as that which Senator McCARTHY and others seek. Mr. Kraft would approach the problem through "a long-term confidential study made under an undoubted Presidential mandate by a panel including representatives of the executive, the legislature, and the public, with a staff drawn from past officials of the Agency who can go through files knowing what to look for."

While the larger and longer range approaches for other proposals may be desirable, in the present context of our immediate needs for information in the foreign affairs area, and especially in our need for exploration of every facet of the situation in Vietnam, it seems likely that Senator McCARTHY's proposal, directed toward working through the existing Foreign Relations Committee, could bring the fastest and most pertinent results for immediate use.

As Mr. Kraft notes, the current demands are based on well-founded misgiving about the role of the CIA, which is staffed by men whose careers, in Mr. Kraft's words, "are products of tension with the Soviet Union. They comprise a cold war establishment. Their bureaucratic interest is to not come in from the cold."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK: LEFT IN THE COLD
(By Joseph Kraft)

Well-founded misgiving on the role of the Central Intelligence Agency has inspired new sentiment for a congressional watchdog committee. But that is like prescribing pills for an earthquake.

The trouble that afflicts the CIA is the same trouble that afflicts the military services and the section of the State Department that heads up in Secretary Rusk. Their careers are products of tension with the Soviet Union. They comprise a cold war establishment.

Not surprisingly, they have trouble adjusting to the change in the international climate that has been at work since about 1953. Their bureaucratic interest is to not come in from the cold. Increasingly at odds with reality and with enlightened opinion, they more and more tend to set up impenetrable barriers of self-defense.

The CIA is simply the most spectacular example of the general phenomenon. At the high tide of cold war in the 1950's, it had a special place in the sun. Because its director, Allen Dulles, was the brother of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the Agency had immediate, informal and easy access to the highest quarters on all matters of foreign policy.

From the universities and law firms, Dulles brought to the Agency a second wave of bright and dedicated people to serve under the first wave that had been washed into intelligence work during World War II. He carried out for the Agency a special role as a fourth arm of foreign policy responsible for paramilitary operations.

Several of these operations, notably one in Iran, were brilliantly successful, as was the development of the U-2 reconnaissance aircraft.

In at least some countries abroad, the CIA station chief came to count for more than the Ambassador. A huge CIA headquarters was built near Washington. All in all, for the CIA the Double Dulles era was a golden age.

The changed international climate that coincided with the end of the Double Dulles era featured Communist pluralism and a shift to the underdeveloped world as the chief testing ground in the struggle for primacy. Instead of having to meet known and massive Communist threats, the Agency, in the new environment, had to cope with shadowy movements, capable of turning either toward nationalism or communism.

But instead of switching to more subtle tactics, the Agency in operations in Indonesia, Singapore, Cuba, and in the Dominican Republic acted as if it still faced the same old challenge from monolithic communism. And when these operations turned sour and drew criticism, operation self-defense came strongly into play.

For instance, the Agency put out stories on a Soviet department of disinformation, thus implying that all criticism was merely Russian propaganda. It fostered, if nothing more, the publication of spy diaries, stressing the value of espionage, and the danger

of peaceful contacts with the Soviet Union. It put out economic statistics designed to show that the Soviet Union was in so much trouble that it made sense not to try to develop East-West trade.

Leadership tended to develop along similar lines. The CIA is not really under control of its director, Adm. William Raborn who has proved to have no flair for the job. It is being run by Deputy Director Richard Helms, a career professional, intelligent and sophisticated, but an organization man who has spent 20 years at CIA headquarters, managing flaps and defending bureaucratic interests.

Given these formidable self-defense mechanisms, it is foolish to imagine that a congressional group working part-time with only the most limited knowledge of the present to say nothing of the past could exert any impact on the agency.

What is required is a far more formidable enterprise—a long-term confidential study made under an undoubted Presidential mandate by a panel including representatives of the executive, the legislature, and the public, with a staff drawn from past officials of the agency who can go through files knowing what to look for.

To be sure, no President likes to accord that kind of mandate to groups not under his control. Still, the countervailing argument is very strong. If the President is not himself the prisoner of the cold war establishment, most of the rest of us are.

Their self-defense tactics are a principal reason why it is almost impossible to generate meaningful discussion, and in that way sound opinion, on a subject of such vital public concern as the war in Vietnam.

THE ROAD TO NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the December 18, 1965, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature contains a stimulating article by Mr. Sanford Gottlieb entitled "The Road to Negotiations." It is a discussion of the Vietnam issue from the viewpoint of one who has consistently advocated a greater diplomatic and political initiative on the part of the United States to find the basis for a settlement of the conflict. Mr. Gottlieb has been a longtime student of international affairs. He has on several occasions conferred with representatives of both North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. He believes that the war in South Vietnam had its roots in the refusal of the Diem regime to proceed with the elections and reunification of Vietnam called for by the Geneva accords of 1954. Believing that Members of the Congress will find his article of interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE ROAD TO NEGOTIATIONS
(By Sanford Gottlieb)

There is little agreement among historians and governments on the origins and character of the war in Vietnam. After the 8-year war of independence against the French by the Vietminh, the Geneva accords of 1954 divided Vietnam temporarily into two zones, to be reunited through free elections in 1956. Ho Chi Minh, the Moscow-trained Communist who led the successful fight against the French and was considered a national hero, consolidated his power in North Vietnam, while in South Vietnam the United States

helped to create what Walter Lippmann has called an anti-Chinese, pro-American regime under Ngo Dinh Diem as a buffer against the spread of communism.

No doubt Ho Chi Minh confidently looked forward to winning the 1956 reunification elections. But Diem refused to discuss election arrangements with the North. Hanoi was thus confronted with a choice; a separate, hostile regime in the South, or reunification by force. Diem helped bring the situation to a head by his own insensitivity to the needs of his people. In 1956 he abolished the elected village councils that constituted the only form of democratic rule in South Vietnam. He thereby imposed on the villagers, who make up 85 percent of the South Vietnamese population, the dictatorship that he exercised from Saigon. During the same period Diem set up detention camps for political opponents and began to fill them with many of the ex-guerrillas who had fought against the French. Some, but not all, of these "former resistance members"—who were supposedly protected by the provisions of the Geneva accords—were Communists. Allowing no room for legal opposition, Diem pushed his political opponents toward the use of armed violence. By 1956, according to the British scholar P. J. Honey, "it was already clear that Diem was establishing an authoritarian regime which would tolerate no political dissent."

Independent observers such as Bernard B. Fall, author of "The Two Vietnams," and Brian Crozier, author of "Southeast Asia in Turmoil," set the date of the beginning of this war at 1957 or 1958. They suggest that at the outset it was an effort by separate factions of South Vietnamese to defend themselves against Diem. "The Vietminh were involved, but at that stage they were in the minority," Crozier has written. "Most of the insurgents belonged to one or another of those curious politico-religious sects that are peculiar to Cochinchina: Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and Binh Xuyen (whose chiefs also gained control over in Saigon). . . . All three sects had private armies, and all three had played a part in the first Indochina war. In the spring of 1955, Diem had smashed them. . . . Crozier adds that toward the end of 1957 the remnants of these sectarian armies and the Vietminh dug up their hidden arms and took to battle.

Any aid from North Vietnam at that stage was undoubtedly very modest, although this aspect of the war was to change later. Official South Vietnamese estimates of the number of cadres and military personnel illegally introduced from north to south in 1959 put the figure at only 300. The same estimates indicate a combined total of 21,700 in 1961 and 1962.

The origin of the war thus seems rooted in two conditions: The refusal of the Diem regime to proceed with reunification of the divided country, and that regime's attempt to wipe out all political opposition. At the outset, the conflict was basically a civil war within South Vietnam. In time each party to the civil war was to become increasingly dependent upon outside support and direction. North Vietnam assumed general leadership over the Vietcong guerrillas, while the United States gradually gained a commanding voice over the Saigon Government's conduct of the war.

To the State Department, however, the picture is different. "The assault on the Republic of Vietnam is, beyond question, an aggression," Dean Rusk said in August. "It was organized and has been directed by North Vietnam, with the backing of Communist China. . . . The war in Vietnam is a test of a technique of aggression: what the Communists . . . call 'wars of national liberation,' to destroy by force any non-Communist government."

Whatever the war may have become recently, it is doubtful that those who were be-

ing hunted down by Diem's forces in the late 1950's were interested in testing the political-military techniques that were later to be spun into theories by the Chinese. Most Vietnamese harbor a historic enmity for the Chinese, an enmity born of 1,000 years of domination. Nor is it likely that men (as well as women and children) will spend years in the hunted life of the guerrilla without having some more tangible goals. These goals have been offered to them by the National Liberation Front.

In March 1960, guerrillas in South Vietnam calling themselves the Nam-Bo Resistance Veterans Organization met in hiding and declared that they had taken up arms in self-defense. In September 1960 the North Vietnamese Communist Party took note of the southern people's revolutionary struggle and advocated the establishment in South Vietnam of a broad national united front against the United States-Diem clique. In December 1960 the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam was created. Brian Crozier believes that as early as 1959 the North Vietnamese Communist Party showed its intention of directing the insurrection in the south, whose leadership had by that time been assumed by Communist elements. On the other hand, such French observers as Philippe Devillers and Jean Lacouture believe that Hanoi belatedly and rather reluctantly came to the aid of its embattled brethren in the south. The truth may lie somewhere between these two versions, with Hanoi's original moral encouragement being replaced over the years by a flow of arms, trained cadres, and political directives.

The NLF is a Communist-style revolutionary popular front, with specialized organizations for workers, women, intellectuals, ethnic groups, etc. The South Vietnamese Communist Party is only one of the political groupings that ostensibly make up this coalition. Until this summer the Communists (known as the Popular Revolutionary Party) downplayed their influence. The most visible leadership posts are given to non-Communists. A former Saigon lawyer, Nguyen Huu Tho, holds the top nominal office of chairman of the NLF Central Committee. Only one of the five vice presidents on the Central Committee is a Communist. However, the French journalist Georges Chaffard, who has interviewed the NLF leaders in the jungle, says that "the numerical preponderance appears in all the intermediary bodies, where the proportion is about 2 out of 3."

The Vietcong is simply the military arm of the NLF. The name is a pejorative one (roughly translated as "Viet Commie") applied by the Saigon government. Many of the Vietcong guerrillas still think of themselves as members of the Vietminh. The Vietcong is divided into hard-core forces, regional units, and local militia. The hard-core units are composed largely of veterans of the war against the French who stayed in the south after 1954 or who went north for further training and later infiltrated southward. They are constantly on the move and launch the major Vietcong attacks. The regional units operate within their own province. Their main assignment is to protect and guide the hardcore forces that move through their province. From 1960 to 1964 there were between 20,000 and 25,000 hardcore Vietcong, and roughly 60,000 to 80,000 irregulars. By the fall of 1965 there were an estimated 70,000 hard-core and 90,000 irregulars. In 1965, for the first time, the United States claimed that units of the North Vietnamese regular army were fighting alongside the Vietcong, and the steady introduction of these regulars to match the American buildup no doubt accounts in good part for the swollen guerrilla ranks.

Several years ago the Vietcong regulars were equipped primarily with American arms captured from the South Vietnamese Army or brought on the open market, as well as

with more primitive home-made weapons. Today the majority of hardcore units have reportedly been reequipped with Communist-bloc arms, mainly of Chinese manufacture.

Among the Vietcong defectors I interviewed in South Vietnam was a sturdy young gold-toothed peasant from Dinh Thuong Province in the Mekong Delta. He had served 4 years in the guerrillas before defecting; he had joined because he believed the NLF assurances that he would be fighting against the domination of his country by the United States and for a better life for the people. He defected, he said, because the NLF did not keep its promises and because it did things "to hurt the people." This former guerrilla was probably referring to the terror which the Vietcong uses as a systematic policy along with persuasion and reform. The terror takes the form of the assassination and kidnapping of village officials, especially those who are disliked by the villagers. The persuasion is often exercised by example, such as helping peasants to repair roads or harvest crops. Where land reform has been an issue, the NLF has been on the side of the landless peasants. The relative mix of terror and persuasion varies according to the locality and the situation.

As the military requirements of the war have increased, the Vietcong has not had the time to cultivate the loyalties of the villagers. There have been recurrent stories lately that the Vietcong has been seizing the rice for its troops, whereas it formerly offered the peasants both receipts and elaborate explanations. Likewise, there are indications that the Vietcong is impressing young men into military service, a practice that may not be limited to one side.

On paper, the NLF program is mild and reformist. In the absence of non-Communist reporters from the areas effectively controlled by the Vietcong (about half the population of South Vietnam and roughly two-thirds of its territory), it is difficult to know what changes they have effected. The NLF apparently has a parallel government in the areas it controls, and it apparently collects taxes and operates such services as schools and hospitals.

There is virtually no way to measure public opinion in South Vietnam. Even without a war, it would be difficult to assess the real feelings of people in a largely peasant country that has known no free political process. The war, of course, complicates the task.

"The lesson we have learned from this long war is that we lose one freedom after another," one of the top Buddhist leaders in South Vietnam told us. "We have lost our sense of solidarity, unity, and mutual understanding. The people have no self-confidence. They are at the crossroads of conflicting interests." A young intellectual Buddhist monk said, "We all have a kind of anxiety and despair. We are trying to find out who is the real enemy. As for the Vietcong, the Cong (communism) is the enemy, not Viet (nationalism). Discrimination, violence and hatred are our enemies. These enemies exist not just in the Vietcong, but in our hearts and minds. . . . We don't need to recapture land from the Vietcong, but to win the hearts of the people. . . . We don't want to live under communism or under the conditions of war. . . . The peasants are interested first in being alive."

This last sentence probably sums up the single strongest feeling in the country. The people in both the hamlets and the cities would like, first, to see an end to the war. But they have no idea how peace might return. Beyond this, it is difficult to make generalizations. My own hunch is that if the people truly felt free to express themselves, they would tell everyone—the Vietcong, the Saigon government, the North Vietnamese, and the Americans—to get out and leave them alone. One has the impression of South Vietnam as a lush green

trap, in which most of the population is caught "at the crossroads of conflicting interests."

The Saigon government represents no one except perhaps the top military, the bureaucracy, and those members of the urban middle class who have profited from the war. In the Vietcong-controlled areas, no one can be sure how much of this control represents loyalty and how much reflects fear. Both sentiments undoubtedly intermingle. In the chasm between the highly organized political machine of the NLF and the tiny personal circles around the Saigon government, there are many genuinely opposed to the front who nevertheless remain indifferent or hostile to the government. One of the tragic aspects of Diem's legacy, however, is that they are largely outside the political process. These are the Catholics, many of the Buddhists and members of the religious sects, the labor unions, the students, and even veterans of the Vietminh.

No group is monolithic and, in byzantine South Vietnam, perhaps any group is bound to be less monolithic than elsewhere. Yet it is clear that the Catholics, many of whom escaped from the North, constitute the single most vehement anti-Communist bloc. The members of the Hoa Hao and Cao Dai, the sects that helped to trigger the insurrection against Diem, are largely anti-Communist (although they are no friends of the Central Government). While a few of the Buddhist leaders have been suspected by some Westerners of harboring pro-Liberation Front sentiments, there is no evidence of this. As a political force, the Buddhists have only once made effective use of their mass base. In 1963 the self-immolation of Buddhist monks and street demonstrations by thousands of the faithful led to the downfall of Diem. Since then there has been little sign of a Buddhist political program or a willingness to share in power. One of the jobs probably assigned by Ambassador Lodge to Edward Lansdale, former CIA specialist in counterinsurgency techniques, is the development of anti-Communist political forces capable of standing up to the front.

There were subtle but potentially crucial differences in emphasis between the NLF and Hanoi representatives with whom I spoke. The North Vietnamese stress the need for reunification of the country through negotiations between North and South. The NLF stresses the neutrality (a word never mentioned by the North Vietnamese) of South Vietnam and talks of reunification as a distant goal, perhaps 20 years away. I interpret these nuances as a desire for autonomy from Hanoi on the part of the front. There are traditional regional differences between the Vietnamese of North and South on which such feelings could be based. Moreover, the NLF is conscious of socioeconomic differences between the two Vietnams. The southern bourgeoisie and landowning classes are stronger than were their counterparts in the North when the Communists came to power, according to the front.

Whatever the current power relations between Hanoi and the NLF (and I am prepared to accept Philippe Deviller's current assessment that Hanoi directs the strategy but not the tactics of the front), the autonomous spirit within the NLF can flourish only under conditions of peace, not under the discipline of war.

Contrary to the widespread public assumption that the United States has been consistently interested in negotiations while North Vietnam has spurned them, Eric Sevareid's article in *Look* and other news reports have forced the administration to admit that Hanoi agreed to meet in Rangoon at U Thant's suggestion in 1964 and that Washington rejected the move. The State Department was also obliged to admit that, during the 5-day pause in the bombing of North Vietnam in May, the North Vietnamese

requested talks through the French Government.

I have discussed this North Vietnamese "signal" with three different administration policymakers. Each had a different explanation of why Hanoi's approach did not lead to negotiations. The first official said that this was not the kind of signal we were looking for. The response merely raises the question: What kind of signal were we looking for? The second official indicated that the North Vietnamese were posing an unacceptable condition, a new coalition government in Saigon dominated by the NLF. This, too, raises a question: Did we try to find out whether the unacceptable condition was negotiable? The third official had still another version. He said that the message was transmitted by the French Government to the administration after the bombing had resumed, whereupon the administration tried to get a higher official in Hanoi than the North Vietnamese representative in Paris to repeat the offer. According to this version, this effort was unsuccessful. However, assuming the accuracy of this sequence, why didn't the United States agree to halt the bombings again and pursue the problem under less inflammatory conditions?

I think it is fair to say that the United States was uninterested in negotiations before April, became more interested during the summer, and, following the first flush of military victories, concluded that perhaps the war could end without negotiations, by a North Vietnamese-NLF decision to halt large-scale operations. This alternation of attitudes in Washington was based on both the military situation in South Vietnam and an assessment of the political risks involved in negotiating a settlement that would include a coalition government in Saigon. The question of coalition is the key. For the moment, Washington appears to have decided to fight on rather than permit the inclusion of the NLF in a new Saigon government.

As for the Hanoi-NLF bargaining posture, it will be difficult to know their real attitude until the United States stops the bombing of North Vietnam. As Senator GEORGE Aiken, of Vermont, has observed, the bombings of Germany and Great Britain during World War II did not bring their governments to the peace table and Pearl Harbor did not weaken America's resolve to resist. All the evidence is that continued bombing has hardened the North Vietnamese position. This should not be too surprising, because of their anticolonial background, their ideology, their isolation, and their relative position of weakness vis-a-vis the major capitalist power in the world. They say they are looking for "signals" from us, just as we are looking for signals from them. The signals that they want are acts of military restraint. Until the United States is willing to run the risks of such acts, it is doubtful that we will know whether they are interested in a negotiated settlement. Beyond an end to the bombings, Hanoi and the NLF insist on agreement in advance on these basic principles of the 1954 Geneva accords: the ultimate withdrawal of foreign military forces and bases; a prohibition against military alliances; and the peaceful reunification of the two Vietnams.

If both sides eventually find it in their common interest to encourage a new coalition and abide by the essentials of the Geneva accords, very early in any political settlement there must be a resumption of the economic and personal links between the two Vietnams broken off by Diem in 1954. Traditionally, the rice of South Vietnam was exchanged for the raw materials of the North. Regardless of how long political reunification may take, this trade should rapidly be resumed as one way to weave the torn country together. And for the thousands of families divided by the partition, who are

now permitted to exchange only one postcard a year, there must be a resumption of travel and communications before the healing can begin.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the early days of the Peace Corps, some Members of Congress referred to it as Kennedy's Kiddie Korps. But an overwhelming number of Senators and Representatives saw it for what it was—and is: A practicable idea to help developing nations help themselves by providing them with trained manpower. And so, on September 22, 1961, in the first year of the administration of former President John F. Kennedy, the Peace Corps Act was passed.

1966 is a significant year for the Peace Corps. It marks the Corps' fifth anniversary and the departure of its Director, Sargent Shriver. Under his leadership, the Peace Corps has grown from an idea into a worldwide force for international understanding. He leaves with the Peace Corps firmly established on three continents. Today some 10,200 volunteers are at work in 46 nations.

In Africa the Peace Corps is operating in 19 countries. From Kenya to Ghana, where the first overseas contingent of volunteers arrived in the fall of 1961, some 3,711 Peace Corps men are now a familiar part of everyday life. Most of these volunteers—about 2,000—are involved in secondary education; in 7 African nations, more than half of the teachers with college degrees are volunteers. Think what it would mean if these teaching positions were filled by Red Chinese.

Nearly 4,000 Peace Corps volunteers are serving in 18 Latin American nations, where the emphasis is on community action programs, involving the efforts of more than 2,000 volunteers. Latin America is also the site of one of the Peace Corps' most ambitious programs: an educational television project in Colombia that is currently beaming lessons to more than 300,000 primary school students. And think what that means in a nation where many teachers have only a sixth-grade education.

The Peace Corps is also at work in nine nations of Asia. Education is the main concern of the 1,681 volunteers in this area. But, as on the other two continents, there is a diversity of programs. In Thailand, volunteers have made a significant contribution to the national malaria eradication program. In Malaysia, young nurses have carried modern medicine into areas where people still rely on the "Bomoh" or medicine man. In 1963, the Philippines' Ramon Magsaysay Award, Asia's equivalent of the Nobel prize, was awarded to all Peace Corps volunteers working on that continent.

Sargent Shriver's contributions as Peace Corps Director also have been officially recognized in Asia. In January 1964, he went to Bangkok to receive an honorary degree at Chulalongkorn University. During the ceremony, the Thai Foreign Minister said:

Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great nation as a wealthy nation, a powerful nation, endowed with great material strength and many powerful weapons. But how many of us knew that in the United States ideas and ideals are also important? This is the secret of your greatness.

As a Senator from Alabama, I am proud that a number of my constituents have recognized the significance of Peace Corps ideas and ideals, and served overseas as volunteers. And as a Member of this Senate, I am equally proud that the support for the Peace Corps was both overwhelming and nonpartisan. This too was and is one more tribute to Sargent Shriver's leadership of the Corps.

JOB CORPS GIRLS START TO WORK

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring to the attention of Senators a story about a young lady from my State who is a recent graduate of the Los Angeles Women's Job Corps Training Center.

The story was written by Mrs. Elizabeth Shelton, staff writer for the Washington Post. The young lady is Willye L. Evans, 20, of Oklahoma City.

It is of paramount importance that industry scrutinize the graduates of the Job Corps for potential job placement. This point of view is well expressed by W. C. Hobbs, senior vice president of Consolidated American Services, Inc., and chief executive of its management and engineering services division. This company was the first to hire male Job Corps graduates and now blazes a new trail by being the first in private industry to hire female graduates of the Job Corps.

Mr. Hobbs feels certain of the abilities of the Job Corps graduates. His quotation is worth repeating:

I feel very strongly that in the Job Corps, industry has a natural young mine of flexibility and a pool of labor—

He said—

Just because these are poor kids who have dropped out of school doesn't mean they are not good workers.

Once industry realizes they have a pool, and can direct the skills and technical training they need, they are going to come to Job Corps and say, "I need so many of this type of skill."

This is an inspiring and impressive story. It should be of interest—of great interest—to all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the story from the November 30, 1965, Washington Post be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 30, 1965]

JOB CORPS GIRLS START TO WORK

(By Elizabeth Shelton, Washington Post staff writer)

The first two career girls to come to the Capital with Job Corps diplomas as their credentials are happily at work in the downtown office of a management consultant firm.

Juana Marie Waquiu, a 21-year-old from Jemez Pueblo, N. Mex., arrived here yesterday to double as a PBX switchboard operator and receptionist with the management and en-

gineering services division of Consolidated American Services, Inc. She was the first graduate of the Los Angeles Women's Job Corps Training Center.

The second graduate, Willye L. Evans, 20, of Oklahoma City, Okla., has been on duty in the same office for a week as a clerk-typist. "It's just like home," Willye says. "Everybody is so friendly."

Both live on Buchanan Street NE, with the family of a member of the MES staff.

Neither has had a chance yet to sight-see around the city, but Willye went on a motor trip in Maryland on Sunday and thought it very nice.

Her mother is a domestic worker in Idabel, Okla. Willye tried working her way through Langston University in Oklahoma but had to leave in her second year because her salary as an assistant to the adviser of the New Homemakers of America was applied only to tuition and left her no money for expenses or to send home.

She plans to go to business college at night with an eventual goal of teaching business subjects. She attended the Metropolitan Junior College in Los Angeles and graduated in 5 months.

Juana, daughter of a carpenter, attended Albuquerque Business College, in New Mexico, for a year, but couldn't find a job in that city. She learned switchboard operation at the Los Angeles Trade Technical College while enrolled at the Los Angeles Job Corps Center.

Back at home are five brothers and two sisters. The older sister is married and the oldest of her brothers helps his father, but the others are still of school age and Juana helps to support them.

The brandnew white-collar girls make \$2 an hour at their new jobs. They will receive in-grade promotions and the chance to rise, through training, to new grades.

W. C. Hobbs, senior vice president of Consolidated American and executive chief of its MES division, is confident the Job Corps is producing a competent employment pool for industry.

The organization was the first to hire male Job Corps graduates as employees and found their work so satisfactory that two are being given additional pay and responsibilities. The third was assisted to return to high school so he will have a base for higher education.

One of the reasons that Hobbs feels so assured is that the 24-hour-a-day living experience at a Job Corps center gets everything about the enrollee's abilities and habits down on the record.

"This provides a great deal more information than a series of interviews, or even a job trial," he said.

"I feel very strongly that in the Job Corps, industry has a natural young mine of flexibility and a pool of labor," he said. "Just because these are poor kids who have dropped out of school doesn't mean they are not good workers."

"Once industry realizes they have a pool and can direct the skills and technical training they need, they are going to come to Job Corps and say, 'I need so many of this type of skill.'"

"This is one place where the Government is spending money that is an investment. The kids will put money back into the country."

WE MUST RESTORE IMPACTED SCHOOL AND MILK FUND CUT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the recent budget estimates submitted to Congress by the administration call for drastic cuts in programs that are most vital to the State of Utah and to the country in general.

I refer to the recommendation that \$234 million be cut from the appropriations of Public Law 874 and the almost 80-percent decrease in the milk fund program.

Public Law 874 was first passed to alleviate the tremendous tax disadvantage suffered by States and school districts having large Federal establishments or federally owned property within their boundaries. As is commonly known, this Federal property is not taxable by a State or school district. In Utah, the Federal Government owns about three-fourths of the land. Thus the taxable property in our State, used in large part to finance our school system, is reduced very extensively. Our people are now making a supreme effort to provide the best possible education for our schoolchildren. We stand at the top in the total percent of per capita income spent per pupil. Thus our efforts and our needs completely justify the retention of Public Law 874 at the estimated level of \$417 million.

In certain Utah counties federally impacted area funds make up nearly half of the school operating budget. If this program is drastically cut as proposed by the administration, what are those counties to do? They cannot tax Federal property. The local tax burden is already difficult to bear. How then can these and other districts across the Nation replace this revenue that the Johnson administration would cut off?

Last year I opposed the Federal aid to education measure because of an unfair formula which required Utah to pay some 20 percent more into the fund than it would receive. Now we learn that the Utah impacted school district program will suffer as result of other Great Society programs. The Federal Government has a definite responsibility in connection with impacted areas and this cutback will cause serious hardships for the districts where heavy defense facilities have been established.

Public Law 874 is an example of equity and I have supported it in the past. It must not be terminated. It would be a false economy move penalizing the efforts of hundreds of school districts to meet difficult financial burdens partially imposed by the Federal Government.

A second matter which I would like to review is the administration's plan to cut the school milk fund from \$103 million in fiscal year 1966 to \$21 million in fiscal year 1967. Once again, this is a false economy move. There are many other areas where this administration can begin an economy move which will not affect the nutrient level of our schoolchildren. Under the present program each child receives a half-pint of milk with his or her school lunch. If the administration's recommendations are followed, the entire program will become discriminatory. Many children, even if the parents can afford to buy the milk, will begin to pass up the chance.

If the efforts to curtail the program succeed, only children who can be shown to be needy will receive assistance. Are we now to have teachers ask "All poor children raise their hands"?

IV of that act—in an amount of \$461 million is also provided. The bill sets the amounts of loans, guarantees, and commitments that may be outstanding at any one time under each fund.

I urge my colleagues to join in protecting the direct business loan program so that it may have the necessary resources in the future to carry out its important function.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from New York is granted.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "Huff Proud of Guys in Vietnam," written by Steve Guback, and published in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, February 3, 1966, dealing with observations by Sam Huff, outstanding American athlete, in praise of armed services personnel now fighting in Vietnam.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

A memorial tribute to William McKinley, delivered at the wreath-laying ceremony at the tomb of the late President William McKinley, on January 29, 1966.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

Article entitled "Third National Conference on American Indian Health," written by Agnes Fahy and Carl Muschenheim and published in the Journal of the American Medical Association of December 6, 1965.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Newspaper articles dealing with the death of Cleon Throckmorton, stage designer.

RESTON POINTS TO U.S. CLEAN HANDS IN VIETNAM; THE GREAT UNAPPRECIATED U.S. ASSET

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, few observers bring more competence, understanding and objectivity to the debate over Vietnam than James Reston of the New York Times.

This morning Mr. Reston reports that one of the genuine obstacles this country encounters is trying to persuade the U.N. that the United States simply wants to defend a principle and nothing else.

As Mr. Reston puts it:

There is a tragic misunderstanding among many about the policies and purposes of the United States. * * * They do not quite believe that the United States is making all this effort, taking all these casualties and appropriating all this money in order to defend a principle and then go away. Washington has said it time and time again—it wants no territory, it desires no military base, it has no commercial interest in Vietnam, but even many of the allied delegates take all this with a knowing and skeptical grin.

As Reston says if we told other nations we were fighting for rubber and rice or for a base like Singapore, they could understand it—not approve—but understand.

And yet Mr. President, our greatest strength in Vietnam is this fact—that our hands are clean. We want nothing—but to stop aggression and permit an

independent country to retain its right to determine its own way.

In the long, long run much can be decided by the good opinion of mankind—by the conviction that one side is morally right. We have this strength in Vietnam. Our moral case is far stronger than it has somehow come through—in spite of a valiant effort by the administration, especially by President Johnson.

It is through this moral case—this willingness of a great nation to pay such a terrible price for a principle in which it deeply believes—that eventually this Nation is going to prevail.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by James Reston in today's New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1966]

UNITED NATIONS: VIEW FROM THE EAST RIVER
(By James Reston)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 3.—The Vietnam issue has now moved from the brilliant arena of the United Nations Security Council chamber to the delegates' lounge, which has comfortable chairs, a well-stocked bar, and a lovely view of the East River.

The conversation is more civilized here. The delegates talk with a little more freedom and humanity about the struggle in Vietnam, but even when they stop spouting propaganda, it is clear that there is a tragic misunderstanding among many of them about the policies and purposes of the United States.

Plainly put, it is simply that they do not quite believe that the United States is making all this effort, taking all these casualties, and appropriating all this money in order to defend a principle and then go away.

Washington has said it time and time again—it wants no territory, it desires no military base, it has no commercial interest in Vietnam, but even many of the allied delegates take all this with a knowing and skeptical smile.

Maybe it is not surprising. The world is not accustomed to powerful nations fighting 10,000 miles from home for anything but commercial or strategic interests. The idea of America spending its wealth in Vietnam rather than adding to its wealth, as others have done in that tragic country, is not easy for cynical minds.

This is the paradox in so many of these private talks—if the United States were fighting for the rubber and rice of Vietnam, as the French did, or trying to establish a Gibraltar or a Singapore there, the delegates might not approve of such a policy but they would understand it easier than our promise to defend freedom and then go home.

"What are you doing at Kam Ranh Bay?" an old allied friend said today. "I can see that it helps your supply problem, but you are spending \$100 million on it. Is this necessary for this war, or are you building for the long future?"

Kam Ranh Bay, north of Saigon on the South China Sea, fascinates the veteran diplomats here. It is one of the finest natural protected harbors in all of Asia. The Russians used it in the Russo-Japanese war against the Japanese and the Japanese used it in the last war against us, and Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam dreams about it as another great commercial tourist and naval center, like Singapore or Hong Kong.

The delegates know we are wasteful, but when they see us creating another Okinawa there, they wonder. They are polite about

it. They do not charge us with deceiving them, but they ask questions and they clearly have their doubts.

"Let us assume you achieve your ends," another diplomat said. "You hurt the Vietnamese and North Vietnam finally and they agree to talk, and some kind of compromise government is set up in Saigon and you go away."

"China," he continued, "will still be there. You will have defended your principle, but how long will it last? And what will you achieve that will justify all the sacrifices you and others will make between now and then?"

These are the imponderables behind the more technical debate in the Security Council. It is ironic to hear them at the U.N., whose charter obliges all members "to take effective collective measures * * * for the suppression of acts of aggression."

This, of course, is precisely what President Johnson thinks he is doing. His tactics are open to question and his objective seems dim, but his principle of opposing aggression is clear, and this was what the United Nations was all about.

"Yes," said the old diplomat, "it is hard. We can believe anything at the U.N. except somebody following the charter if it is not clearly in his interests. One day maybe somebody will make a soft landing on the earth, but that time is not yet."

MILWAUKEE SENTINEL AND WASHINGTON POST SCORE MEANS TEST FOR SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I indicated last week in discussing the administration's plan to confine the special milk program for schoolchildren only to the needy, this program could be implemented only with the aid of an onerous means test. I am very glad to say that two of our Nation's finest newspapers, the Milwaukee Sentinel and the Washington Post, have editorialized on this very point.

The Sentinel correctly points out:

Medicare was sold in part as a way to get away from having to apply means tests to the elderly. Now, at the time the Medicare program is getting under way, the Federal Government is reverting to using a means test—worst of all on children at their most impressionable age. Some other way ought to be found to save \$52 million.

The Post hits this point hard in an editorial that appeared in today's edition. First the Post points out that market demand for milk has risen so sharply that the school milk program can no longer be justified as a means of diverting milk that would otherwise be surplus into schools. This statement overlooks the fact that the recent decline in milk production is seasonal only. There is no doubt in my mind that in the months ahead we will again be presented with a substantial milk surplus as dairy farm efficiency continues to result in high production.

Despite this mistaken argument in support of cutting back the school milk program, however, the Post concludes that the program should not be cut because "this country can afford to encourage nourishing diets for its schoolchildren." The editorial emphasizes that "the talk of needy children and needy schools merely veils a whole new apparatus of means tests."

February 4, 1966

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 1 more minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

As the Post puts it, "the prickly task of defining need is to be left to local school authorities" in no way lessens the impact that this means test will have on individual children, especially in small schools where all the children know each other and thus know who has been categorized as needy by the school authorities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the Milwaukee Sentinel and the Washington Post be printed in full in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A POOR CRITERION

In his attack on the cut President Johnson proposes for the school milk program, Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin, raises several serious questions.

To our mind, the most telling question he has raised is whether this proposed re-orientation of the milk program to direct it "primarily to helping needy children" is going to make it necessary to apply a means test to determine what children will receive milk under the program.

"Nothing is more abhorrent in my mind than requiring first and second graders to give evidence that dad is too poor to pay for a half pint of milk," PROXMIRE told his Senate colleagues in remarks denouncing the milk program cutback proposal.

Medicare was sold in part as a way to get away from having to apply means tests to the elderly. Now, at the time the medicare program is getting underway, the Federal Government is reverting to using a means test—worst of all on children at their most impressionable age. Some other way ought to be found to save \$52 million.

HEALTHY, WEALTHY, AND UNWISE

"The school lunch and special milk programs will focus more on needy children," the President said in his budget message. He intends to accomplish this laudable purpose by cutting the subsidies for milk and lunches heavily, and then giving a minor fraction of the savings to special help for poor children.

The Federal Government currently is spending \$100 million a year to subsidize more than 3 billion half-pint bottles of milk for schoolchildren. The new budget proposes to cut this investment back to \$21 million. There is still to be milk for those schools with no other food service, according to the budget, and free milk for children who need it. The prickly task of defining need is to be left to the local school authorities.

About 18 million children now get federally subsidized school lunches daily. The new budget would cut the subsidy for most children by about 1 cent per lunch, and use some of the savings to increase the help for the meals in "needy schools." The net reduction would be \$19 million.

One reason for these cuts is the recent change in the market for dairy products.

Previously the subsidies merely bought milk that the Government would otherwise have had to buy under the price support program. But market demand has risen while dairy production has dropped significantly and the subsidies are emerging, for the first time, as a real cost to the Government. But the milk and the lunches served a better purpose, all these years, than merely keeping up farm prices. They were good for children, and the children continue to need them. The talk of "needy" children and "needy" schools merely veils a whole new apparatus of means tests. There is a category of subsidies, in which the unit costs are low and the benefits broad, which are properly distributed without means tests. This country can afford to encourage nourishing diets for its schoolchildren even in a year when dairy prices no longer require that support.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, before the time of the Senator from Wisconsin expires, will he yield to me for a comment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for his effort to persuade the Committee leadership to return the school milk program to an equitable basis. I believe the editorials which he is submitting for the Record indicate that public awareness is developing in support of this effort. I have joined him in the past, and I have announced that in the event the committee fails to return the sums, both for the school milk and the school lunch programs, which I hope they will do, I shall offer from the floor, if need be, an amendment to return them to an equitable level. But I look to the Senator, as I have in the past, in the Appropriations Committee, to insure that we get right with our consciences on this subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and of course I shall be delighted to cosponsor or support any legislation along this line which he may introduce.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM CONTROVERSY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, thoughtful debate on Vietnam is desirable. Any analysis of the problems, the concerns, and the possibilities are welcome. I believe that we would enable the development of a greater balance and realization of the competing principles which are at work, as we seek a sound course of action in Vietnam, if Senators should read the thoughtful article which was published in the Christian Science Monitor on Tuesday, February 1, under the byline of Saville R. Davis, entitled "Political Concepts Color Vietnam Controversy."

Mr. Davis touches sensitive nerves, but he reminds us of the underlying prin-

ciples which all sides to this debate should realize can be honorably entertained by someone with whom we may disagree.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 1, 1966]

POLITICAL CONCEPTS COLOR VIETNAM CONTROVERSY

("Tell me a man's political ideas and I'll tell you what he thinks about Vietnam." This remark, in one of the many intense discussions of topic No. 1 here, touched off the following report on conversations typical of current debates on Vietnam between liberals, conservatives, and moderates.)

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—When the outer layers are peeled off the now familiar arguments over Vietnam, the going gets more difficult. Debate hardens close to the core. There is a tendency, observable in countless such arguments here, for ideologies to take over.

It is the man on the radical right who wants to challenge Asian communism at the source in Peiping. It is the committed left-winger who wants to pull out. It is the political center, and the moderates on each side, who argue within the limits of the present U.S. policy—the balancing of both peace-making and force.

For anyone who is baffled or frustrated by the argument over Vietnam, it is useful to take it apart. What are these fixed positions that divide the sophisticates in this Capital City, where the debate constantly rages?

To begin with, all hands want peace. The difference comes over how to get there. The rightist thinks the Communists will back down if you really challenge them. The leftist says this is a revolution more than a war; that the real conflict is political and eludes military force. The moderates don't accept either thesis, and so combine some of each.

This is an echo of the ideological debates of the 1930's turned the other way around. In those days the right couldn't quite believe that Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese militarists were as bad as they seemed to be. Weren't they holding the new threats of communism and socialism and leftist trade unions in check? So the right declined to take a firm stand against the Fascist aggressor. And the result was the Fascist advance until it had to be stopped by world war.

Today the tables are turned. It's like a square dance: "The head couples cross over, and on the other side stand."

LINEs TIGHTEN

Now it is the left that cannot quite believe the Communists are as bad as they seem to be. Aren't they bringing social change, albeit roughly and forcibly, where change is badly needed? Aren't some Communists less dangerous than others? Aren't the native radicals in countries like Vietnam the people who ought to be encouraged? So the left gravely doubts the value of an all-out cold-war stand against the Communists in a backward country like Vietnam.

In any conversation there is always a certain amount of preliminary sparring.

Says the left: Communism is not like fascism. You cannot compare the two. Hitler went against the tide of history, against the tide of social reform. Communism uses extremist methods, to be sure, but it moves the other way. Its fault is that it goes too far, trying to use violence to topple the old order.

Says the right: But communism is a power system, and this is a world divided into two great power blocs just as it was before. Start one side down the warpath of aggres-

sion and I don't care what you think of its motives—it will upset the balance of power. The result, just as it was with Hitler, will be a world war to stop it. Maybe a nuclear war this time. And a dictatorship of the left is worse than a dictatorship of the right—it destroys the values of an organized society.

The two arguments don't meet. Then the lines begin to tighten.

Right: If you force the issue, and stand up to the Communists right now, that would end it. They would have to back down. They can't take it.

Moderate: Why can't they? The Germans did, when their cities were half destroyed. The Japanese did, when Tokyo was half burned. The Communists are a resourceful, determined adversary. Why should they give in? Show them force, but then give them a chance to back down. Don't threaten their lives and make them fight for survival. Let them live, so long as they don't cross someone else's border.

Left: That won't work either. You "show them force" and you are already on the treadmill, going up. They have to match your force each time, and you have to match theirs. The only way out is to recognize that the Vietnamese patriots of the resistance movement, now based on Hanoi, don't want to become lackeys of Peiping any more than the South Vietnamese do. Leave them alone and they will resist the Chinese Reds.

Right: That's nonsense. They are captives of Peiping. You don't seriously think the hard-core, pro-Chinese faction in Hanoi would let the Independents or the pro-Soviet faction play Tito, do you?

Left: Well, Tito did, and got away with it. He's still standing, and the Kremlin is coming his way, now.

Moderate: I think you both overemphasize the need to end the war quickly. Neither of you like land fighting, and it is ugly stuff, to be sure. Man against man, as well as machines and chemicals against men. It revolts kindhearted men and women and sensitive, young students. You all applauded President Kennedy when the Cuban crisis was over. It was over nice and quickly. But let's not fool ourselves, he was playing with something far worse than in Vietnam—nuclear fire.

That's the only way to stop aggression—to have it out sooner rather than later. But he stopped the Russians with nuclear missiles. Had anything gone wrong, some 200 million people could have been killed in the first exchange. The casualties in Vietnam are inhuman enough, but they are not to be compared with the risks in the big Western tests of strength in the cold war, and you both approved those.

RULE OF THE FEW

Right: But the use of big force worked, didn't it? The Russians were stopped. And the Chinese would be, too.

Left: You are both missing the point. Cuba was a showdown directly between Khrushchev and Kennedy. So were the Berlin crises. In southeast Asia, it is the little Vietnamese who are being half destroyed while the big powers have it out on their territory.

I repeat: this is more a political and social revolution than it is a war, for the Vietnamese. The rule of the few, established by the French and taken over, unfortunately, by the Americans, is being overthrown by native revolutionaries, just like the resistance movement in France. Granted they turned to the Communists for help and get their guns and strategy from the north. But to the Vietnamese, this is mostly a long overdue revolt against a medieval order.

Right: The Communists came to the villages of Vietnam with revolutionary propaganda and blandishments, all right. But they held on with naked terror, directed against the village chiefs and landowners and the life. And now it has turned into a ruthless

increase of Vietcong taxes and seizures of crops and forced drafting of peasants for soldiers. What kind of revolution do you think the Vietnamese want?

Moderate: Ambassador Lodge is trying very hard to bring a revolution, American style, so the people will have an alternative choice to Communist revolution. You know the peasants are familiar with what happened in North Vietnam and China: First the farmers were promised land; then their crops were nationalized at low prices fixed by the state. That was no revolution. Mr. Lodge and the AID administration and some of the military people—particularly the marines—are going all out to help the villagers in the right way.

DOOR OPEN TO RADICALS

Right and left both: Come, come. Surely you don't think that the American Government machine is going to conduct a revolution in the middle of a terrible war? Or that the Vietnamese military government really wants it? Be realistic.

Right: Besides it's too dangerous in wartime. You open the door to social change and radicals will walk in. Then you've lost your war and your revolution, too.

Left: The United States simply isn't going to give the radicals a chance. We have almost always intervened on the side of reaction in Asia, and against social change. We think that's the only safe way. We don't trust revolutionaries. No, this question has to be left to the Vietnamese. Americans, cautious as we are, can't conduct their revolutions for them.

Moderate: Leave it to the Vietnamese, indeed. They are the ones who don't know how. First the French and then, I am sorry to say, the Americans armed and financed one old-style dictatorship after another, and no reform movement was allowed to show its head. We have to help them modernize their government. We have to stop preventing them from doing it, and turn around and show them how. As things stand now, if we pull out and "leave it to them," the Communists will easily take over.

Left: But they won't. This is where you don't understand politics. The Vietnamese are more intelligent and independent minded than you think or the American officials over there pretend. Like everyone else, in this modern world where social change and the toppling of reactionary governments is in the very wind, they know what they want. And the last thing they want is the Communist Chinese.

Right: The Communists would never give them a chance.

POWER DISPUTED

Moderate: I agree. We come right back to where we started. We have two issues here and we can't separate them. One is power, the other is social change. So far as the Communists are concerned this is a war of conquest and we can't let them win it. That would be the direct road to world war. So far as the Vietnamese are concerned, this is the moment for that long-promised civilian government in Saigon that will take care of its people's needs and not just sit on the lid and hold the people down. We have to do both.

Right: You talk of power but you don't understand power. That's the trouble with you middle grounders. You are moderates and you want to use power moderately and it can't be done. In a test of strength, you have to be ready to go the limit and force the other fellow to recognize it and therefore to back down. If you are determined enough and know your own mind and understand the way power works, you can do it. Otherwise the Communists, who know what power is, will simply do you in.

Moderate: Don't call me names or I'll retaliate. You know what power is, all right—power that leads straight up the lad-

der to world war. It's the civilian control of power, using it with restraint and not ever allowing it to get out of hand, that is our only hope in today's nuclear world.

ASSURANCE LACKING

Left: Power, power—you talk of nothing else when the world cries out for a decent life in these countries and that's a kind of power you don't understand. Give it a chance and it will outwit the Communist. They can't rule other countries with success today, any more than the old colonial countries could. Communist rule would generate the resistance to overthrow it.

Right: Well, just don't give them the chance to try, thank you very much.

Moderate: Gentlemen—listen to me. The left can't give us any assurance that the Communists won't use violence, as they frankly say they will, to get control of third countries and hold their control. The right can't give us any assurance that the game of power won't end in world war—nuclear war.

You are each obsessed with only one side of this picture. We have to deal with both problems—the military and the civilian—and help to show the world that both political power and military power can be used in strict subordination to the democratic ideal.

CASE RESTS

Left: It's just like the Negro problem in the South. If you talk even-handedly in a nice idealistic way about balancing law and order, on the one hand, and equal rights on the other, all you'll get is law and order, and no rights. Unless you put your social convictions first, the conservative structure of society will prevent you from achieving them—the police and military will steal the show away from your ideals every time. It's that way in Vietnam.

Right: Unless you defend your world against the totalitarians, you won't have any world to practice your ideals in. Unless you're stronger than they are, and prove it, the world is theirs because they'll take it. And then where will your convictions be?

If the listening correspondnet can break in at this point, he will rest his case. Without pressing the point too far, the conversations like this that rage up and down Washington show a pattern. When the chips of argument are down, it is the ideology, the political attitude of each speaker, that usually gives shape to his arguments.

Since there are more moderates than men of the right and left in Washington today, and in the country as well, it is the moderates who have the most votes for the present. And in the future?

FOREIGN AID PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP FOREIGN AGRICULTURE

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, President Johnson has sent to the Congress a message setting forth his suggested program on foreign aid. I am particularly happy with two aspects contained in these proposals. I was gratified to see that economic aid was separated from military assistance and to note that the emphasis on developing foreign agriculture was prominent.

There is no economic success story quite like the story of American agriculture. From farm superabundance, Americans are able to provide vast amounts of surplus foods to the lesser developed nations of the world.

But U.S. productivity cannot forever—or for long—keep pace with the demands of hungry populations, increasing at a rate of 2½ to 3 percent every year. By 1975, it is estimated that the

world food gap will exceed the entire current production of American wheat. By 1985, it will surpass America's total productive capacity.

These staggering projections make it very plain that countries facing food shortages must raise the productive capacity of their farmlands and bring unused reserves of land under cultivation. President Johnson proposes to bring more and more of our resources to bear on this critical problem in the year ahead.

Many of us are familiar with some of the programs underway in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

In Mexico, we have seen what commercial credits can do for the small farmer who needs insecticides for his cornfields or a new well to improve production.

Thanks to the introduction of commercial fertilizers in south India, the productive capacities of 46,500 farmers have been raised.

The fertilizer program was developed by AID technical teams, part of a contingent of 1,000 U.S. technicians currently working throughout the world to help farmers solve production problems.

At the same time, the multiple agricultural services provided AID have persuaded many governments to streamline their own national farm production policies. For example, in the past year India completely reversed prior policies by establishing a production-incentive, price-support program for grains.

In Latin America, 14 countries have instituted land reform programs and the pace at which Latin American farmers are actually getting land titles is steadily increasing.

All of these are convincing reasons for making available to people in other lands the technological advances which have helped to make our farmer, in the President's well-chosen words, "the greatest producer the world has ever known."

UMW JOURNAL ARTICLE CLAIMS RESIDUAL OIL DUMPING OUTLAWED BY GOVERNMENT OF VENEZUELA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the February 1, 1966, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal includes an interesting article in discussion of action by the Government of Venezuela decreeing that no discounts in excess of 10 percent below the posted price of residual oil will be permitted.

The article in the UMW Journal, by Bushrod Howard, speculates that the Venezuelan Government's action could mean an increase in the price of residual oil imported into the United States of up to 30 cents a barrel, equivalent to \$1.30 per ton of coal.

Mr. Howard's article further notes:

This action of the Government of Venezuela proves the contention of the UMWA and the coal industry that Venezuelan residual oil has for years been dumped in the United States by the international oil companies at distress prices in order to drive American coal out of its traditional markets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the United Mine Workers Journal thought-provoking article be printed in

the RECORD because it is a candid discussion of a subject—residual fuel oil imports—which had attention in this Chamber earlier in the week.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United Mine Workers Journal, Feb. 1, 1966]

RESIDUAL OIL DUMPING OUTLAWED BY GOVERNMENT OF VENEZUELA

(By Bushrod Howard)

The Government of Venezuela has decreed that no discounts in excess of 10 percent below the posted price of residual oil will be permitted. This could mean an increase in the price of residual oil imported into the United States of up to 30 cents a barrel, equivalent to \$1.30 a ton of coal.

This action of the Government of Venezuela proves the contention of the UMWA and the coal industry that Venezuelan residual oil has for years been dumped in the United States by the international oil companies, at distress prices, to drive American coal out of its traditional markets.

Venezuela's action also proves what this writer has maintained for the past 7 years, that the international oil cartel has consistently misrepresented the position of Venezuela to the U.S. Government, to the Congress and to the American public. These selfish advocates of a policy that dumps residual oil at distress prices in order to drive coal out of its markets, have persisted and have been supported by the U.S. Department of State. The State Department has contended that any restriction on residual oil imports would harm United States-Venezuelan relations.

NO CONFLICT BETWEEN VENEZUELA, UNITED STATES COAL

There is not, and never has been, any conflict between the interests and objectives of the Government of Venezuela and the American coal industry. Last week, representatives of the Venezuelan Government once again confirmed this fact to the writer. Venezuela does not want its oil dumped at distress prices. Venezuela does not want to have its oil burned under boilers if this means that there will be no adequate return on what is an irreplaceable natural resource. When the international oil companies sell Venezuelan residual oil at a distress price to compete unfairly with American coal, they are wasting Venezuela's capital and principal source of wealth.

Why has Venezuela waited for 7 years to take this action? The answer is simple. Venezuela had been blackmailed by the international oil cartel. The cartel decided to exploit the vast, low-cost—and politically unsafe—Middle East oil fields and keep Venezuela's oil as a future reserve. Venezuela's normal petroleum markets in South America, the United States, Canada, and northern Europe were given to Middle East oil. Venezuela was given the "residual oil market," which was expanded into the American coal market, by selling the residual oil at ever lower prices.

Why did Venezuela not complain to and explain its position to the Department of State? The Venezuelans and other small countries have long believed that the international oil cartel controls American oil policy in Washington and that an open fight with the oil interests would result in an actively hostile policy by the Department of State against the complaining government. In 20 years of experience, I have never been able to find any evidence that would convince a reasonable man that this fear was not true.

What made the Venezuelans act? Undoubtedly, it was Secretary Udall's recent

and dramatic increase in the residual oil quota of 35 million barrels. The Venezuelans had hoped that a realistic quota, together with increasing demand, would result in a reasonable price for its residual oil. Secretary Udall's actions indicated to Venezuela that either quotas would be removed altogether or be increased so that they would be virtually meaningless. This meant that its share in the price of residual oil would constantly decrease as the cartel dropped the price to obtain more and more of the American coal market. Its move was a move of desperation.

The oil lobby has already started a major offensive to discredit Venezuela. It now talks of an adverse effect on the balance of payments (although it used to say that payments to Venezuela did not affect our balance of payments, as Venezuela spent all the money that it received in the United States). The oil lobby also maintains that New England consumers will suffer. Yet, it is established American policy to protect single commodity exporting countries against disastrous falls in price. An example is the International Coffee Agreement, which increases the price of coffee to the American consumer, but protects Brazil and other coffee producers against disaster.

It is, in this writer's opinion, time to start to tear off the American flag that the oil lobby wraps around its selfish and dangerous policies. Venezuela's complaints are justified and have existed for at least 10 years. Venezuela and the American coal industry have had no conflict of interest or of policy. Yet, the oil cartel, for quick and immediate profits, has wasted the natural resources of Venezuela in an attempt to destroy American coal's natural domestic market.

Venezuela is the most secure and friendly country on which to depend for any oil we may need for foreign sources. In World War II, although in the early years all petroleum shipping was sharply curtailed by submarine action, Venezuelan oil was the most dependable of any foreign source. The Middle East oil fields were useless. In the Korean war the Iranian refinery, on which we depended for aviation gasoline, was unavailable (Mossadegh had nationalized the oil industry). But, Venezuelan oil was available. In the Suez crisis, we again had to rely on Venezuelan oil, as the unstable Middle East oil again was cut off.

The oil cartel makes more money on Middle East oil. It has, therefore, made the United States and its allies increasingly dependent upon Middle East oil. It has made sure that in the U.S. oil import program no advantage will be given to Venezuelan oil.

Now Venezuela has decreed that its residual oil may not be exported without a fair payment to Venezuela. Its motive and its interest is plainly expressed in the decree, "the economic preservation of oil which is the basis of the country's economy and the principal source of income for its development."

All Venezuelans are waiting to see how successful the oil lobby will be in its attempt to force a cancellation of this decree. It only acted because the residual oil quota policy of the Department of Interior was hurting it as much as it was hurting the American coal industry. If the oil lobby succeeds in bringing major American pressure on Venezuela to surrender, Fidel Castro and the Communists will be the major beneficiaries, because it will appear to Venezuelans that "monopoly capitalism controls American policy."

What Venezuela has done is reasonable and necessary protection of its major capital resource. It is an attempt to limit the destructive and economically senseless fight between American coal and Venezuelan oil that only benefits international oil. It is not only in the interest of the American coal industry, but in the larger American national interest,

that Venezuela, a friendly and democratic country, be given a fair and impartial hearing by the American Government.

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES BY SENATOR CASE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement for my wife and myself of our assets and liabilities at the end of 1965 and our income for that year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSETS	
Cash in checking and savings accounts (after provision for Federal income tax for 1965) and U.S. bonds, approximately-----	\$55,000
Life insurance policies with the following insurers (currently providing for death benefits totaling \$144,585): U.S. Group Life Insurance; Aetna Life Insurance Co.; Connecticut Life Insurance Co.; Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Continental Assurance Co.; Equitable Life Assurance Society; Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia; Travelers Insurance Co.; cash surrender value and accumulated dividends-----	57,855
Retirement contract with Federal Employees Retirement System (providing for single life annuity effective January 3, 1967 of \$13,116 per annum). Senator Case's own contributions to the fund total, without interest-----	24,684
Annuity contracts with Teachers Insurance & Annuity Association and College Retirement Equities Fund. As at December 31, 1964, these contracts (estimated to provide an annuity beginning at age 65 of \$953) had an accumulation value of-----	9,250
Stocks as listed on schedule A-----	280,570
Real estate: consisting of residence building lot on Elm Avenue, Rahway, N.J., and house in Washington, D.C. (original cost plus capital expenditures, \$71,400, less mortgage on Washington property, \$24,679)-----	46,721
Tangible personal property in Rahway apartment and Washington house, estimated-----	10,000
Contingent interest in a small trust fund of which Chase Manhattan Bank of New York is trustee; income from this was less than \$20 in 1965.	
LIABILITIES	
None except mortgage above listed.	
INCOME IN 1965	
Senate salary and allowances, \$31,050, less estimated expenses allowable as income tax deductions of \$6,800 (actual expenses considerably exceed this figure)-----	24,250
Dividends and interest on above securities and accounts-----	11,555
Brookings Institution seminar-----	150
Miscellaneous: Chase Manhattan Bank, trustee, and Investors Diversified Services-----	25

CLIFFORD P. CASE,

FEBRUARY 4, 1966.

No. 19—3

SCHEDULE A

Stocks

(Common, unless otherwise noted)

	No. of shares
American Electric Power Co.-----	896
American Natural Gas Co.-----	548
American Tel. & Tel. Co.-----	200
Cities Service Co.-----	104
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York-----	400
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York \$5 preferred-----	50
Detroit Edison Co.-----	100
General Electric Co.-----	100
General Motors Corp.-----	150
Household Finance Corp.; \$4.40 cumulative convertibles preferred-----	100
International Business Machines Corp.-----	30
Investors Mutual, Inc.-----	2,319,079
Madison Gas & Electric Co.-----	120
Marine Midland Corp.-----	563
Merck & Co., Inc.-----	200
Tri-Continental Corp.-----	1,200
Union County (N.J.) Trust Co.-----	224
Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical Co.-----	200

THE RESUMPTION OF BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, possible resumption of bombing in North Vietnam was discussed last Sunday in Oklahoma City, before the President announced his decision. Five Members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation were present at a press conference attended by State publishers and editors assembled for the annual meeting of the Oklahoma Press Association. All five said they would, of course, support President Johnson if he should make the decision to resume bombing. Besides myself, those present from the Congress were the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and U.S. Representatives TOM STEED, JOHN JARMAN, and JED JOHNSON, JR.

My distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY] elaborated on his support of the President in a telecast over KOCO-TV, Oklahoma City, on Monday night after the decision was announced.

I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of his television comment placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY ON KOCO-TV, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1966

I support the President. He is taking the only course possible in ordering the resumption of bombing of North Vietnam.

He sought in a worldwide effort to bring the dispute to the peace table during the suspension of the bombing in North Vietnam for more than a month. He now asks the United Nations to mediate the dispute.

I favor the same pattern of bombing that prevailed before the suspension, striking at military targets such as armament and ordnance concentrations, camps, and supply routes and trails. The effectiveness of our

military operations in South Vietnam in support of the South Vietnamese Government requires the constant interdiction with conventional high explosive weapons of the supply routes from the north.

AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY—ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, every Member of this body is aware that American agriculture has just begun to emerge from an era of decline. The number of family-type farms continues its downward spiral, but net farm income is at an alltime high—up nearly 40 percent in the last 5 years alone.

The fact that American agriculture has survived this trying time at all is largely the result of imaginative and intelligent legislation written by Congress in the last few years.

One of the architects of this agricultural prosperity was my distinguished predecessor, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. If we are seeking an accurate appraisal of where American agriculture has been, and an enlightened prediction of what lies ahead for it, we could logically turn to Mr. HUMPHREY.

He has provided us with such a statement. On November 18, 1965, before the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, Minn., the Vice President summarized the agricultural situation in which we find ourselves today. He also turned to the future, not only in domestic agriculture but to the necessity of creating agricultural abundance abroad.

I commend the remarks of the Vice President on this occasion to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, ST. PAUL, MINN., NOVEMBER 18, 1965

One hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln said, "I like to see a person proud of the community in which he lives. And I also like to see someone living in such a way that his community is proud of him."

This can be said today of the Farmers Union GTA and my friend Bill Thatcher. For more than 50 years your organization has led the way toward agricultural progress. I might add that, without your help, much of today's constructive farm legislation never would have been enacted.

I have worked for the American agricultural community for many years. For I know the strength—and not just economic strength—that our Nation draws from the soil.

In many of those years I must say that I have felt a disappointment, and sometimes even discouragement, regarding the result of those efforts, and the efforts of so many others.

But today the words are not disappointment and discouragement—they are optimism, faith and hope.

The time is near when, I believe, this Nation and the world will both fully utilize—and fully appreciate—the positive force for good that lies in our American farmland.

Times are good. Net farm income is up—and on the way up. Net income per American farm this year will be \$4,150—nearly 40 percent higher than just 5 years ago.

At the same time, take a look at the silos. Surpluses are down. Grain surpluses are near adequate reserve levels for the first time in nearly a decade.

Farm exports are up. This fiscal year we will export over a billion dollars worth each of wheat, feed grains and soybeans. Today one of every five acres of American farm production goes into world markets.

And all the while, the American people continue to enjoy an increasingly better bargain in food. The average family spends less of its income today for food than ever before—and will spend an even smaller portion in the years ahead.

Only 5 years ago, many people felt only an aching frustration when they thought about agriculture. The prevalent notion was that no solution could be found to the problems of surplus and subsidy through farm programs.

That was the beginning of an arduous struggle to devise farm policies which would improve farm income and make better use of our abundance—policies which would balance production with use while reducing surpluses and their cost.

It has been a period of trial, a period in which the extremes in farm policy have been gradually cut away. Few people today—far fewer than in 1960—hold the position that farm programs are not needed.

There is a growing realization that—if we are to continue to enjoy the benefits of an abundant agriculture—then we must insure that it is both productive and prosperous.

On November 3 President Johnson signed the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, a legislative landmark which reflects the new approach to farm policy which began to develop 5 years ago.

In the words of the President:

"With this legislation, we reap the wisdom required during more than 3 decades of trial and effort.

"Our objectives remain what they have been for more than 30 years:

"To let the free American farmer use all his skill and initiative to produce agricultural abundance, in return for a fair reward.

"To bring every American a plentiful supply of food, at the lowest possible cost.

"To avoid accumulating costly surpluses of commodities we do not need."

This new agriculture program recognizes that the marketplace is the best mechanism to determine the flow and pace of commercial farming. Most farm products will no longer move in domestic and world markets at artificially high prices. Instead, they will be guided by conditions of supply and demand.

The income gains made over the past 5 years will be maintained and strengthened through direct payments to farmers who cooperate in the program.

And with a 4-year program, the farmer will be able to plan ahead with greater assurance than ever before.

Yes; we have turned a corner in our agricultural policies. But we do not delude ourselves into thinking that these policies in themselves will give us all the answers for the future. No, what we have done today is to set our agriculture house in better order so that we may begin to challenge the priorities of tomorrow.

That is why I am particularly pleased to see Dr. Sherwood Berg here with us tonight. He has been selected by President Johnson to head the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber in an exhaustive study of the future implications of farm policies on the domestic economy and on our world posi-

tion. This study will be done by 30 of the Nation's outstanding citizens in the fields of agriculture, business, labor consumer interest, and education.

For the first time, too, a President has established a Cabinet-level committee—including the Secretaries of Agriculture, State, Commerce, and Labor—to work with the Commission and to advise him on agricultural policy of the future. He has named Secretary Freeman to lead this activity.

Five years ago, a study of this nature would not have been possible, for all our energy and wisdom had to be directed toward immediate crises: The crises of declining farm income and expanding farm surpluses.

Today we are able to direct our energy and wisdom to approaching needs—needs of a changing American society and a world where population increase threatens to outrun man's capacity to feed himself.

We have learned from a decade and more of experience that food aid is a creative instrument.

Our food-for-peace program is today a basic part of our foreign policy.

But food aid must and will be improved and expanded.

For it is appalling—it is an intolerable statistic—that the diets of two out of three people on this earth seem more likely to deteriorate than to improve in the years just ahead.

And it is equally intolerable that the gap between the rich and poor of the world widens each year.

Where men are hungry, where men see themselves surrounded by a world of wealth they do not share, they are easy prey to prophets of violence and disorder. Hunger and destitution are the recruiting agents for communism.

Men have little time for thought of free institutions—as much as they seek those institutions—while their families lie starving and weak.

And peace has an uncertain life in an environment of injustice and hopelessness.

We can and must continue not only to share our abundance of food and fiber, but also to share our abundance of technical and scientific skills.

We must help developing countries build fertilizer plants, dig wells, use modern tools. And we are. We must help them build rural homes, roads, hospitals and community facilities. And we are.

We must encourage them to allocate their resources not just to long-range projects which may one day aid industrialization—but also to projects which help create a modern, homegrown agricultural economy so that people may be fed now and tomorrow.

We must literally get in and dig and work side-by-side with men seeking a better life in other places.

This great task—this enormous challenge—faces us today and tomorrow. Its dimensions alone require action—action born out of concern for children and nations who hunger, rather than fear of failure.

The stakes are high: The stakes are peace and the future of mankind.

For a just peace, after all, must be established lest all man's progress be lost to the works of war.

And peace will never be established in a world where two-thirds of mankind literally starves for well-being and a place in the sun.

Nor can we of the rich nations live in good conscience, within the walls of our rich city, while our fellow men desperately seek to break out of poverty.

To preserve the peace—to be true to ourselves—we must devote our energies and our productivity to making life happier, freer and more abundant for the whole family of man.

LIBERALIZING TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR THE LONG-NEGLECTED MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure I call attention of the Senate to the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on the bill H.R. 4665, introduced by Representative AL ULLMAN, to liberalize tax deductions for exploration expenditures of the mining industry. Representative ULLMAN's bill is a companion bill to S. 338, which I introduced January 8, 1965, with the co-sponsorship of Senators ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BENNETT, BIBLE, CANNON, CHURCH, DOMINICK, HART, JACKSON, JORDAN of Idaho, LONG of Missouri, MCGOVERN, METCALF, MONTOYA, MOSS, MUNDT, RANDOLPH, and SIMPSON.

The legislation which has now been reported by the Ways and Means Committee—where it was required to originate because it is a tax measure—is one the mining industry has repeatedly indicated would be particularly beneficial to it. The purpose of the law is to remove an existing restriction in the Internal Revenue Code which limits deductions of the mining industry for exploration expenses to a total of \$400,000 with an annual limitation of \$100,000. As I pointed out when I introduced S. 338, this arbitrary restriction on deduction of exploration expenses essential to development of a mining property results in an unwarranted inhibition on investment in mining enterprises. This, in turn, limits employment opportunities, limits income of those employed, and inevitably retards development of mineral resources. Enactment of liberalizing legislation would make possible increased exploration of mineral deposits which, then, instead of remaining worthless and buried, could contribute to a more prosperous economy for the United States.

The mining industry has a special entitlement to the kind of assistance it would receive as a result of liberalizing the tax laws. This industry, uniquely, has been the stepchild of the Federal Government for too long. Relief programs of subsidy, technical assistance and tax relief have been granted for other groups, such as agriculture, transportation, and many other industrial enterprises. In the case of the mining industry, however, very little Federal help has ever been made available. The legislation to liberalize tax deductions for exploration expenditures is a modest step toward obtaining assistance for miners on a scale commensurate with that provided other industries.

Now that the Ways and Means Committee has acted, I hope the measure will pass the House quickly and that we will have an opportunity to pass it in the Senate in the very near future.

A TENNESSEAN ON THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, for the first time a Tennessean has been appointed to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This Commission brings together representatives of